THE DECLINE OF POLONNARUVA AND THE RISE OF DAMBADENIYA

(circa 1180 - 1270 A.D.)

b y

Amaradasa Liyanagamage

Thesis submitted for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of London

1963

Abstract

In this study an attempt is made to examine the developments in the history of Ceylon from the death of Parākramabāhu I to the end of the reign of Parākramabāhu II covering a period of roughly a century (c.1180 to 1270 A.D.). The unity and general prosperity which the country enjoyed under Parākramabāhu I gave way to dissension and disintegration soon after his death. The forces of disintegration moved on until about four decades after Parākramabāhu's death Dambadeniya emerged as a new centre of activity and of resistance to foreign invaders with the foundation of a royal residence there. The difficult problems concerning the disintegration of the Polonnaruva Kingdom so soon after reaching its culmination under Parākramabāhu I, and the subsequent rise of Dambadeniya to importance under Parākramabāhu II form the subject of this study. In chapter I the introduction sets out some of these problems and then procedes with the discussion of the sources. Apart from the Pali Chronicles, other literary works, written both in Sinhalese and Pali, will be examined with a view to estimating their historical value. After this analysis of the sources, chapter II deals with the developments which followed the death of Parākramabāhu I after giving a brief outline of his reign. Here the process of the disintegration of the Polonnaruva Kingdom has been examined with an attempt to determine the possible causes. Chapter III deals with the examination of the circumstances that led to the foundation of a royal residence in Dambadeniya. This chapter discusses the role of Vijayabāhu III, the founder of Dambadeniya, together with that of other local rulers in parts of Rohaṇa and Māyārattha. The next chapter

states some of the difficulties which arise from the principal sources dealing with Parākramabāhu II and examines his early life. A major part of this chapter is devoted to an examination of the policies of Māgha, who had invaded and occupied Rājaraṭṭha. Among foreign invaders Māgha is unique in some respects, and for that reason his rule has been examined in detail. The initial stages of Parākramabāhu's struggle with Māgha are also examined in the same chapter. Māgha was not the only foreign invader with whom Parākramabāhu had to deal. His kingdom was invaded twice by the Pāṇḍyas - events not dealt with in the Pali Chronicle but brought to light by South Indian inscriptions. Ceylon was also invaded by Candrabhānu of the kingdom of Tāmbraliṅga in the Malay Peninsula. This is the first known instance of an invasion of Ceylon by a ruler from South East Asia. These events are important for the understanding of the course of the history of Ceylon in this period, and will therefore be considered in detail in chapter V. The last chapter is devoted to an examination of Parākramabāhu's restoration of the ancient cities of Rājaraṭṭha and to a consideration of the extent of his rule and the importance of his reign in the history of Ceylon. The conclusion brings out the principal results of this study.

Acknowledgments

It is my pleasant duty to thank all those who have assisted me in various ways during the preparation of this thesis. It is difficult adequately to express my deep sense of gratitude to Dr. J. G. de Casparis under whose guidance and care this study was undertaken. I have benefitted a great deal from his suggestions and criticisms which have contributed to improve the quality of this monograph. Dr. Casparis gave of his time generously, irrespective of whether it was term-time or vacation. And, above all, he evinced kindness and sympathy even in my personal difficulties. I remain deeply beholden to him.

Similarly Professor A. L. Basham was very kind and helpful throughout this period of study and my most sincere thanks go to him.

I owe a deep debt of gratitude to my teachers in Ceylon, too: Professor H. C. Ray, Head of the Department of History, Vidyālaṅkāra University, helped in arranging this course of studies and took a keen personal interest in my work. In the initial stages Dr. K. W. Gunawardhana, Lecturer, University of Ceylon, encouraged me to pursue this course of studies at a time when I had some hesitation due to personal difficulties. I had several useful discussions with Dr. L. S. Perera, Lecturer, University of Ceylon, which helped me to clarify some problems connected with this study.

I would also like to thank some of my friends who have helped me: On several occasions I discussed certain points with Mr.

R.A.L.H.Gunawardhana, Assistant Lecturer, University of Ceylon, who read through a major part of the manuscript before it went to the typist; Mr. Y. Karunadasa, Assistant Lecturer, Vidyālaṅkāra University, was helpful in elucidating some difficulties arising from certain Pali texts; Mr. K.D.Svaminathan, Assistant Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India, was helpful in clarifying difficulties with the texts of some of the Tamil inscriptions utilized in this study; Mr. K.A.P.Kannangara's reading of the manuscript helped to improve the quality of its English. My sincere thanks are due to them.

I wish to thank the Administrative Staff of the School of Oriental and African Studies and also the staff of the Libraries of the School and the British Museum for their courtesy and helpful service.

Last but not least, my thanks go to the authorities of the Vidyālaṅkāra University for granting me study-leave which enabled me to pursue this course of studies.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

A.I.C.	Ancient Inscriptions of Ceylon, E.Muller.
All.Ind.Or.Conf.	Proceedings and transactions of the All India Oriental Conference.
Arch.Survy.Ind.	Archaeological Survey of India.
A.R.E.	Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy, Calcutta.
A.S.C.A.R.	Archaeological Survey of Ceylon, Annual Report.
A.S.C.Mem.	Memoire of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon.
B.E.F.E.O.	Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient, Hanoi.
B.K.I.	Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië, uitgegeven door het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië('s Gravenhage).
B.S.O.A.S.	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London.
C.A.L.R.	Ceylon Antiquary and Literary Register, Colombo.
C.H.J.	Ceylon Historical Journal, Colombo.
C.J.S.G.	Ceylon Journal of Science Section G- Archaeology, Ethnology etc., Colombo.
Cult.Cey.Med.Times.	Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times, Wilhelm Geiger.
Cv.	Cūlavaṃsa.
Cv.Tr.	Cūlavaṃsa (Translation).
Dal. Pjv.	Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya.
Dal. S.	Daḷadā Sirita.
Elu Av.	Elu Attanagaluvaṃsaya.

Ep. Ind.	Epigraphia Indica, Delhi.
Ep. Zeyl.	Epigraphia Zeylanica, Colombo.
Hvv.	Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa.
Ind.Ant.	Indian Antiquary, Bombay.
H.C.I.P.	The History and Culture of the Indian People / Series, Bombay.
I.H.Q.	Indian Historical Quarterly, Calcutta.
J.A.	Journal Asiatique, Paris.
J.A.S.	Journal of Asian Studies, Michigan.
J.B.O.R.I.	Journal of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
Jkm.	Jinakalamālī.
J.R.A.S.	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, London.
J.R.A.S.Cey.Br.(NS)	Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, (New Series), Colombo.
Ktk.Sng.	Katikāvat Saṅgarā, edited by Sir D.B.Jayatilaka.
Med.Kon.Akd.van Wetenschappen Afd. Letterkunde.	Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, Amsterdam.
Mv.	Mahāvaṃsa.
Nks.	Nikāya Saṃgrahaya.
Pali Lit.Cey.	The Pali Literature of Ceylon, G.P.Malalasekara.
Pjv.	Pūjāvaliya 33-34 Pariccheda, ed. A.V.Suravīra.
P.T.S.	Pali Text Society, London.
Rep.Kg.Dt.	The Report on the Kāgalla District, H.C.P.Bell.
Rjr.	Rājaratnākaraya.
Rjv.	Rājāvaliya.
Rjv.Tr.	Rājāvaliya (Translation).

S.B.E.	Sacred Books of the East.
Sdh.Rtn.	Saddharma Ratnākaraya.
S.H.C.	A Short History of Ceylon, H.W.Codrington.
S.Ind.Ins.	South Indian Inscriptions, Madras.
Sinh.Lit.	Sinhalese Literature, G.E.Godakumbura.
Sinh.Sā.Lipi	Simhala Sāhitya Lipi, Sir D.B.Jayatilaka.
T.B.G.	Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde uitgegeven door het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, Batavia,'s Gravenhage.
The Colas	The Cōlas, K.A.Nilakanta Sastri.
U.C.H.C.	University of Ceylon History of Ceylon edited by H.C.Ray and S.Paranavitana.
U.C.R.	University of Ceylon Review, Colombo.

Owing to an error in the pagination there are no pages numbered: 36, 38, 68, 147, 213, 243, 267, 296, 420, 425.

Chapter I

Introduction and Sources

In this study an attempt is made to trace the course of events that led to the disintegration of the Polonnaruva kingdom and the emergence of Dambadeniya to the position of a seat of royal power. This study covers a period of nearly a century from the death of Parākramabāhu I to the end of the reign of Parākramabāhu II. It is hardly necessary to stress the necessity for a study of this nature. Concerning the period immediately preceding ours, apart from papers devoted to some of the problems in the history of this period which appeared from time to time, two important studies were completed recently. Sirima Wickramasinghe's study of The Age of Parākramabāhu I is not only a thorough examination of the reign of one of the greatest Sinhalese kings, but it could also form a sound basis for further investigation into various other aspects of the history of the Polonnaruva kingdom.[1] More recently W.M.K. Wijayatunga completed a valuable study on The Rise and Decline of the Cola Power in Ceylon.[2] He has examined the course of events that led to the Cola conquest of Ceylon in the early part of the eleventh century and the termination of the Cola rule in Ceylon. This has also necessitated a careful study of the reign of Vijaya-

---

[1] Ph. D. Thesis, University of London, 1958 (unpublished).

[2] Ph. D. Thesis, University of London, 1962 (unpublished).

bāhu I who played the dominant role in the expulsion of the Coḷas from Ceylon. These two monographs together cover the reigns of two important rulers of the Poḷonnaruva kingdom, which in some respects marks the greatest achievements of the Sinhalese kings.

The present study in which we have sought to examine the disintegration of the Poḷonnaruva kingdom and the rise of Daṁbadeṇiya as a seat of Sinhalese royal power could well be a complementary monograph in relation to the works cited above.

So far no comprehensive study of our period has appeared. From time to time several scholars have sought to concern themselves with particular problems in the history of this period. On the period up to the foundation of Daṁbadeṇiya as a royal residence, Professor S. Paranavitana drew attention to 'Three Coḷa Invasions not Recorded in the Mahāvaṁsa', which appear to have taken place in the reign of queen Līlāvatī.[1] In 1958 B. J. Perera made a notable attempt to analyse and interpret the political aspects of the confusion that set in after the death of Parākramabāhu I.[2] Prior to that - as early as 1937 - H. W. Codrington set out the possible causes for 'The Decline of the Mediaeval Sinhalese Kingdom' in a paper read before the Royal Asiatic Society.[3] More recently Murphey

---

[1] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXI, No. 82 (1929), 384-87.

[2] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. V, 173-82.

[3] Reprinted in J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VII (1960), 93-103.

Rhoads examined this question by a comparative study of the decay of other Asian civilizations; he concluded that the collapse of the irrigation system was due to the break-down of the socio-economic organization on which it was dependant for its effective maintenance, as a consequence of repeated foreign invasions and internal dissension and so led to the collapse of the Sinhalese kingdom.[1] We have examined these arguments and shown now far they may be accepted.

More recently, Sirima Wickramasinghe contributed a useful chapter to the University of Ceylon History of Ceylon, in which she sought to examine in brief the developments in the period covered by the successors of Parākramabāhu I up to Māgha's invasion of Ceylon.[2] Also Paranavitana's contributions to the same publication are very valuable.[3] While these are notable additions to our knowledge of this period, it was far beyond the scope of this publication to undertake a detailed examination of all problems arising from the troubled history of the island in this period. Hence our attempt to examine these problems in greater detail requires no apology.

---

[1] 'The Ruin of Ancient Ceylon', J.A.S., XVII (1957), 181-200.

[2] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II (1960), Ch. VI, 507-25.

[3] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, Ch. VII, 529-60, VIII, 563-609.

As to the period of the Dambadeniya kings, similarly important attempts have been made to understand some aspects of its history. It is but natural that in the early years much of the energy and enthusiasm of scholars was directed towards the various problems connected with the history of the Anurādhapura kingdom and the better times of Polonnaruva under Parākramabāhu I. This concentration of interest was perhaps not entirely due to the vigour and youthfulness of the Sinhalese civilization during that period, but also to the comparatively rich source materials available to them both from archaeology and literature.

However, as early as 1890 F. H. Modder published informative topographical accounts of the Dambadeniya and the Kurunāgala Districts, together with popular traditions concerning this region.[1] These accounts may be of some general interest, but dependent as they are on such popular and unauthoritative works as the Dambadeni Vistaraya and the Kurunāgala Vistaraya they may not prove of much value. Codrington's 'Notes on the Dambadeniya Dynasty' which appeared in 1924 is a noteworthy contribution, in which he drew attention to certain aspects of ths history of the period, particularly the problem of its chronology.[2] Many of his suggestions proved useful in subsequent studies, though in some cases, such as his date for Vijayabāhu III, his conclusions have been seriously contested.[3]

---

[1] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br. , XI (1890), 377-425; XIII, No. 44 (1893),35-37; XIV, No. 47 (1896), 118-24, 134-54; XV, No. 48 (1897),23-37.

[2] C.A.L.R., X, pt. I, 37-53; X, pt. II, 88-99.

[3] Paranavitana, U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 616-17.

One great problem in the history of this period was the invasions of Ceylom by Candrabhānu - his identification and the nature of his expeditions. This problem which had given rise to a great deal of speculation among scholars was settled by Coedès in 1927 with his thorough re-examination of an inscription from Jaiya in the Malay Peninsula, the text of which he had published as early as 1918.[1] These important studies by Coedès, viz. 'Le Royaume de Çrīvijaya' and 'A propos de la chute du Royaume de Çrīvijaya' in which the identification of Candrabhānu had been established almost beyond doubt, are significant contributions to our knowledge of an important problem in the history of Ceylon. Apart from establishing the identification of Candrabhānu, the arguments of Coedès that the latter was a local ruler who had seceded from the imperial control of Śrīvijaya are now generally accepted. While these paved the way for a better understanding of the problem of Candrabhānu much remained obscure.

Some years later Nilakanta Sastri made an attempt to examine this question further in two important papers entitled 'The Ceylon Expedition of Jaṭāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya' and 'Śrīvijaya, Candrabhānu, and Vīra Pāṇḍya' respectively.[2] In these papers Nilakanta Sastri analysed and interpreted the data in South Indian inscriptions which have a bearing on the Pāṇḍyan invasions of Ceylon during the reign

---

[1] B.E.F.E.O., XVIII, No. 6 (1918), 1-36; B.K.I., LXXXIII (1927), 459-72.

[2] 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., Mysore, 1935, 508-26; T.B.G., LXXVII(1937), 251-68.

of Parākramabāhu II and on the expeditions of Candrabhānu. He established the chronological sequence of these events and drew attention to their synchronism. This scholar devoted particular attention to a praśasti of Vīra Pāṇḍya from Kuḍumiyamalai which gives a detailed account of his expedition to Ceylon. This record presents numerous difficulties in its text, and in view of the confused nature of the course of events on which they were focused, this scholar was both cautious and tentative in his conclusions. At that stage he also did not have the opportunity of taking into account the notices of these events contained in the Pali and Sinhalese works other than the Cūlavaṃsa. Even so, these studies mark a further stage of progress in our understanding of an important aspect in the history of this period.

The contributions to the University of Ceylon History of Ceylon by Paranavitana, particularly the chapter on 'The Dambadeniya Dynasty', deserve special mention.[1] An effort has been made not only to synthesize the body of knowledge that has grown over the years, but also to examine some of the problems with a view to opening avenues along which further enquiry could proceed. As such, they form a valuable addition to our knowledge. Being circumscribed by the scope and plan of this publication, some of these problems could not receive the detailed treatment they deserved.

---

[1] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, Book V, Ch. 1, 613-34, see also 636-57.

Some aspects of the history of the Daṁbadeṇiya period became the subject of discussion on the Sāhitya Day celebrations held at Daṁbadeṇiya in 1958 through the auspices of the Department of Cultural Affairs. The proceedings of these discussions have already appeared.[1] The emphasis in the discussions was on the literature of the period, except for the noteworthy contribution by Paranavitana in which he drew attention to the main political events of the period. There he also expressed the view that Māgha, like Candrabhānu, was of Malayan origin.[2]

Sāhityaya, the organ of the Department of Cultural Affairs, Ceylon, devoted a special number to a treatment of the Daṁbadeṇiya period, where again the emphasis naturally fell on its literature, although it also contained brief articles on subjects such as the arts and crafts and the coinage of the period. Some of the contributors have given a brief outline of the political events. These contributions are no doubt useful and are of general interest. However, in so far as the political history of the period is concerned, they have not taken us nearer to the solution of the problems of its history.[3]

---

[1] Daṁbadeṇi Sāhitya Sammēlanaya, Sammēlana Saṭahan, Colombo, 1959.

[2] Daṁbadeṇi Sāhitya Sammēlanaya, Sammēlana Saṭahan, Colombo, 1959, 22-31.

[3] Sāhityaya, Daṁbadeṇi Kalāpaya, Colombo, 1958.

Apart from these Sinhalese publications by the Department of Cultural Affairs, a work of considerable importance, the Dambadeni Yugaya by Degammäda Sumanajoti Thera, appeared on the Sāhitya Day of the same year.[1] This work contains an outline of the political history of the period together with a general account of its administration, economic conditions and a topographical survey of the places of historical interest. A few years later Sumanajoti Thera followed up his work with two more parts.[2] These were devoted to an account of some aspects of Buddhism and a survey of the literature of the period. The two parts, particularly the section on the literature, are the more valuable section of this work. Its bibliography may be helpful to students of the history of this period. The political history is dealt with concisely. The problems of chronology, and the examination of the Pāndya and the Jāvaka invasions were perhaps beyond the intentions of the author. The accession of Vijayabāhu III is placed in 1220, but it is now well known that the initial regnal year of this ruler was 1232. These limitations, however, should not deprive it of its value as a work of considerable importance in as much as it attempts to give a picture of the period as a whole.

---

[1] Dambadeni Yugaya, i. Itihāsa hā Purātattva Vigrahaya, Vakkunuvala, 1958.

[2] Dambadeni Yugaya, ii. Sāsana Vamsaya; iii. Sāhitya Vamsaya, Vakkunuvala, 1961.

In our study an attempt will be made to investigate further the complicated problems referred to above, with a view to indicating possible lines of solution. The reign of Māgha which has hitherto not been examined in detail will receive our special attention. In our study the emphasis will fall on the political developments because of the significance of the problems arising from the political history of the period. This is by no means to suggest an underestimation of the importance of other aspects of its history. In fact we have drawn attention to religious and cultural developments where necessary, in so far as they contribute to a better understanding of the course of its political history. The available material for a study of the cultural developments in this period is richer and should, therefore, form the subject of a separate investigation. For example, substantial data are available for a study of an interesting problem like the condition of the Buddhist Saṃgha in this troubled period, which remains beyond the scope of the present investigation. Two important studies on the culture of this period have already appeared. Dr. M. B. Ariyapala's Society in Mediaeval Ceylon is an examination of the social conditions in the thirteenth century based on Sinhalese literature generally, and the Saddharma Ratnāvaliya in particular.[1] Prof. Geiger's posthumous work which appeared recently, The Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times,

---

[1] Colombo, 1956.

based mainly on a study of the Pali Chronicles is an excellent monograph, which embodies the results of a life-long investigation into various aspects of the culture of the people of Ceylon.[1] These two studies together form a valuable addition to our knowledge, though they by no means exhaust the possibilities of further fruitful enquiry.

Sources

It is necessary to discuss the nature of, and the limitations set by, some of our principal sources within the body of this thesis as they have a direct bearing on the problems concerned. Many of the principal sources utilized in this study are well known to students of Ceylon history and have been the subject of discussion by different scholars. We therefore confine ourselves to drawing attention to particularly noteworthy features and to a consideration of the comparatively less-known works.

Naturally, as in almost any study of the history of medieval Ceylon, the Cūlavaṃsa forms one of the most important sources of information. The so-called Cūlavaṃsa which, in fact, is a continuation of the older Māhāvaṃsa, by different authors from time to time, has been the subject of discussion in the past.[2] In his excellent edition

---

[1] Edited by Heinz Bechert, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1960.

[2] Wilhelm Geiger, The Trustworthiness of the Mahāvaṃsa', I.H.Q.; VI (1930); The Age of Parākramabāhu I, Ph.D.Thesis, University of London, 1958, see chapter on Sources; 'The Cūlavaṃsa', G. E. Godakumbura, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXVIII (1949), 123-25; 'The Sources of Ceylon History', L. S. Perera in U.C.H.C., (1959), I, pt. I, see pp. 51-53.

of this text Geiger has discussed its trustworthiness while drawing attention to some of its deficiencies.[1] He also considered the date and authorship of the work; but much remained yet to be known. In this connection, the examination by Sirima Wickramasinghe of the authorship of the different parts of the Cūlavamsa is particularly noteworthy.[2] She has demonstrated convincingly that chapters lxxix to xc consist of two parts written by two different authors, and not one written by one author as Geiger was inclined to believe. Although no division mark separating the two parts has been detected by Geiger, there is a marked difference in the treatment of 'the epic of Parakkama' from that of the previous rulers as shown by Wickramasinghe. And there is good reason to regard the former as the work of a different author. According to tradition a part of the Cūlavamsa was written by a thera named Dhammakitti during the reign of Parākramabāhu II, which, she is inclined to believe, could be the second part of this work devoted to the reign of Parākramabāhu I.

In so far as we are concerned, what is of direct relevance to our study is the continuation of this Chronicle from the reign of Vijayabāhu II, i.e. from chapter lxxx. According to Wickramasinghe's view this would really form the third part of the Cūlavamsa. That a

---

[1] 2 Vols. P.T.S; London, 1925, 1927, see Introduction; Cv. Tr. 2 parts, Colombo, 1953, see Introduction in part 1, IV-XXX.

[2] Op.cit., see chapter on Sources.

new section of the Chronicle begins at chapter lxxx appears to be beyond doubt. Geiger has noted the words namo tassa bhagavato arahato sammā-sambuddhassa found in four of his manuscripts in verse 84 of chapter lxxix, which is the formula of salutation to the Buddha. This is a clear indication of the beginning of a new section.[1] In a fifth manuscript three, instead of one, division marks occur at this point. Moreover, the narrative takes a different tone exactly where this indication of division occurs in the manuscripts. As pointed out by Geiger and by Sirima Wickramasinghe, what strikes the reader here at once is the definite reference to the misdeeds of Parakramabāhu I. We are told that Vijayabāhu II relieved the people of the suffering caused by the excesses of this ruler who, by this implication, stands rebuked. As the chronicler says, Vijayabāhu II 'in his great mercy released from their misery those dwellers in Laṅkā whom his uncle sovereign Parakkama had thrown into prison and tortured with stripes and fetters'.[2] Quite clearly, these words would not have come from the author who gives a glowing account of Parākramabāhu's great achievements in the preceding chapters. There is therefore no doubt that the Cūlavaṃsa was taken over by a different author at chapter lxxx.

---

[1] Cv., I, p. III.

[2] Cv. Tr., II, p. 125, note 2; Sirima Wickramasinghe, op.cit., see chapter on Sources.

According to Geiger's manuscripts, this third section of the Cūlavaṃsa, as we may call it, seems to end with the end of the reign of Parākramabāhu IV at verse 102 or 104 of chapter xc. Geiger observed:

> 'One of my mss. ends altogether with ch. 90, v. 102. In two of them there is a double division mark after verse 104, and the last one has two division marks after v. 102. They are followed by the verses 103 and 104 which end on the third line of the leaf, the rest of the leaf being left blank and the next one beginning with v. 105. Thus the break is clearly indicated in our manuscripts.'[1]

In the general treatment and tone of this part of the Chronicle, there is no indication of a break at any other point such as the statement pertaining to the reign of Vijayabāhu II cited above. Nor has Geiger detected a break in the manuscripts from chapter lxxx to the end of the reign of Parākramabāhu IV in chapter xc. There is therefore no valid objection to taking these chapters as forming the third part of the Cūḷvaṃsa.

It would, however, be a more difficult task to determine the date of its composition and authorship, of which the text unfortunately bears no indication. In most literary works written from the thirteenth century onwards the authors often give their names and biographical details of the families to which they belong.[2] The author of this part of the Chronicle, perhaps following

---

[1] Cv., I, p. IV.

[2] For example see colophons of Pjv., ed. Suravīra, Colombo, 1961; Saddharmālaṅkāraya, ed. Bentara Sraddhā Tiṣya, Pānadura, 1934; Sdh. Rtn., ed. Dharmakīrti Śrī Suguṇasāra Devānanda Thera, second edition, Colombo, 1955.

the tradition of his predecessors who composed its earlier parts, preferred anonymity.

That this part of the Chronicle was known in the reign of Kīrttiśrī Rājasiṃha is evident from a statement found in the more recent part of the Cūlavaṃsa: 'There was a book, called the Mahāvaṃsa, written in verse from Mahāsammata to (the kings of) Hatthiselapura'.[1] Geiger has drawn attention to the significance of this passage.[2]

There is a possibility of this part of the Cūlavaṃsa being written some time towards the end of or not long after the reign of Parākramabāhu IV. There is evidence of keen literary activity during this period. This period witnessed a keen interest in the writing of the histories of the sacred objects and sacred shrines - often referred to as the vaṃsa literature.[3] The Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa which purports to give a history of the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra was written in the reign of Parākramabāhu II.[4] The Pali Thūpavaṃsa - a history of the stūpas - was written at the request of king Parākrama by Vācissara, who is believed to have been a pupil of Sāriputta during the reigns of Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II.[5]

---

[1] Cv., II, Ch. XCIX, 76.

[2] Cv., I, p.iv.

[3] C. E. Godakumbura, Sinh. Lit., 105-27.

[4] See below, 48-58

[5] Ed. B. C. Law, P.T.S., London, 1935 ; Pali. Lit. Cey., 216-17; There is also a Sinhalese Thūpavaṃsaya, Sinh. Lit., 107-10.

Interest in this class of literature continued in the decades that followed.

The Simhala Bodhivamsaya, based partly on the Pali Bodhivamsa of about the tenth century, was written by Śrī Parākramabāhu Mahāsāmi of Vilgammula at the request of Parākramabāhu IV.[1] Similarly, the Daḷadā Sirita which embodies the history of, and the observances connected with, the Tooth Relic was written in the Śaka year 1247 (1325 A.D.) during the reign of Parākramabāhu IV, possibly at his request.[2] The Cūlavamsa refers to the keen interest which this ruler showed in the Jātakas. It is stated that five hundred and fifty Jātaka stories were translated into Sinhalese and were distributed throughout the island. The Cūlavamsa attributes the authorship of the Daḷadā Sirita to the king himself.[3] In the light of this keen interest in literary activity, particularly in works devoted to the history of the sacred shrines and sacred objects such as the Tooth Relic, stūpas and the Bodhi Tree, it is not improbable that some writer of this period should have taken up the task of continuing the Pali Chronicle which gives the history of the island from the point where the author of the second part left off when he composed it, possibly in the reign of Parakramabāhu II as tradition would

---

[1] Ed. Baddēgama Kīrttisiri Dhammaratana, Matāra, 1911; Sinh. Lit., 118-21.

[2] See below, 70-73.

[3] Cv., XC, 80-86, 77-79.

have us believe. This is at best a probability.

In this connection we may draw attention to another point. We have noted earlier that in one of Geiger's manuscripts two divisions marks are found after verse 102 of chapter xc of the Cūlavaṃsa. Another manuscript ends altogether at verse 102. If this verse marks the end of the work where its author left off, then one may note that the death of the king (Parākramabāhu IV) is not recorded up to that point.[1] In two of Geiger's manuscripts the two division marks are found after verse 104. The latter verse in artificial metre contains the characteristic moral admonition found at the end of many chapters of this Chronicle. Verse 103 refers to his death which, we are told, occurred after his performance of many a meritorious work. Here again the length of his reign is not recorded, though it is usual for the chronicler to mention the duration of the reigns of kings who ruled only a few days or months. Here one might have been inclined to suggest that, since no reference is made to the death or the length of his reign up to verse 102 where, according to some manuscripts, the work appears to end, it might have been composed during his reign while he was yet alive, and that strophes 103 and 104 were inserted by the author of the next continuation of the Cūlavaṃsa. But it would be difficult to maintain such a suggestion if we take into account

---

[1] Cv., I, p.iv; Ch. XC, 102-104.

Geiger's cautious observation:

> 'If we assume that it closed originally with v. 102, which is indicated by two of the mss; then there was added later a summarizing śloka and then a strophe in artificial metre. Exactly the same thing occurs at the close of the first part (79.84). The addition was evidently intended to veil the break in the text and lead over to the new part.'[1]

A further objection can be raised: would a writer have chronicled the events of a reigning monarch during his lifetime in this manner? But this would not be a serious difficulty, for we know that Vijayabāhu I had seventeen years of his reign as a yuvarāja 'chronicled in writing'.[2] And there is reason to believe, as will be shown in the sequel, that at least a part of the account of Parākramabāhu II was written while the king was alive.

It may also be noted that the reign of Parakramabāhu IV is dealt with in some detail in 41 verses, which compares favourably with the treatment given to other rulers of the period.[3] Here again, this need not necessarily mean that this author was close to the times of this ruler, for it may well have been that his rather long reign devoted to services to Buddhism had left a favourable impression, which influenced the author of this part of the Chronicle. Conse-

---

[1] Cv. Tr., II, p. 210, note 4.

[2] Cv., LIX, 7.

[3] Cv., XC, 64-104.

quently, our suggestion as for the date of this part of the Cūlavaṃsa is tentative.

The contents of this part of the Cūlavaṃsa and the limitations of its account will be indicated in the relevant chapters. Chapter lxxx, which deals with the reigns of the successors of Parākramabāhu I, is very brief except for its account of Māgha and his sack of Rājaraṭṭha. In spite of its brevity, one could, however, get an impression of the political confusion of the times when ruler after ruler was ousted or reinstated by the generals who played a dominant role in the political scene at this time. The fact that a whole chapter (lxxxi) is devoted to the brief reign of Vijayabāhu III together with brief notices of a few local rulers is significant. The details concerning these local rulers are particularly important as they are not mentioned in any other source. One could get a fair picture of the manner in which Vijayabāhu rose to the position of the ruler of Māyāraṭṭha, from small beginnings as a vanni chieftain, and the services he rendered to Buddhism.

A major part of the eight chapters devoted to the reign of Parākramabāhu II deals with his services to Buddhism. Although it contains useful information on the political aspects of his reign such as the invasions of Candrabhānu and his struggle with Māgha, much desirable information is lacking. For example, the chapter on 'The Subjugation of Hostile Kings', which undoubtedly contains a good deal of useful data, bears no comparison with the more detailed accounts

of the wars of Parākramabāhu I both at home and abroad.[1] There are also other limitations which in some respects are more serious than those arising from vagueness or the limited nature of its data. Thus, not a word is mentioned about the invasions of Ceylon by the Pāṇḍyan kings during Parākramabāhu's reign, which are established beyond doubt by the testimony of South Indian inscriptions. Here one must recall that the chronicler who recounts enthusiastically the victories of the generals of Parākramabāhu I in South India was silent on the fate which befell them in the end. There again South Indian inscriptions confirm the early victories by the Sinhalese generals as given in the Pali Chronicle. But these records also have established that these generals were in the end routed in battle by the Coḷa kings.[2] That explains the silence of the chronicler on the ultimate failure of these expeditions, which perhaps in his view were not conducive to the greatness of his hero. These limitations should in no way lead to an underestimation of the value of the Cūḷavaṃsa, which contains by far the most detailed account of the reign of Parākramabāhu II. We only draw attention to the fact that some of these limitations deprive a student of the history of this period of the greater advantages of the detailed accounts of the Cūḷavaṃsa supplemented by the comparatively rich epigraphical and archaeological data available to a student engaged in a study of the reigns of Vija

---

[1] Cf. LXXXIII and LXXV-LXXVII.

[2] C.W.Nicholas in U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 481-85.

yabāhu I or Parākramabāhu I.

It is interesting to find out why this part of the Cūlavaṃsa differs considerably from the previous parts. One explanation is that records suffered during Māgha's sack of Rājaraṭṭha. Foreign invasions of course were not a new phenomenon, but there is reason to believe that Māgha's pillage of Rājaraṭṭha led to this result. It is expressly stated that books were torn from their cord and were strewn on the ground. This is a unique measure adopted by any invader, and an attempt will be made to examine the implication of this measure in our study of the reign of Māgha. However, even if these books were mainly concerned with the teachings of the Buddha, there is every reason to believe that records which contained information on various other subjects also suffered at the hands of Māgha. This charge, repeatedly levelled against Māgha, seems to rest on a valid foundation.[1] The Nikāya Saṅgrahaya specifically states that monks who fled to Māyāraṭṭha in search of protection when Rājaraṭṭha was sacked had to leave behind their books amongst other articles lying wherever they were (pat pot ādi pirikara tubū tubū tena hära Māyā rajayaṭa päminī mahāsaṅghayā).[2] While some of these monks came over to Māyāraṭṭha others fled to South India. In doing so not only books pertaining to the Dhamma, which must have

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 67.

[2] Nks., 87.

formed the bulk of it, but also records pertaining to various other aspects of contemporary life might have suffered. Apart from the royal establishments such as the lekam-gē ('the house of secretaries or scribes') which must naturally have housed records pertaining to the administration, the vihāras also would have had very valuable records, which suffered in the course of Māgha's violence.[1]

To add to this, we may also note that the years preceding Māgha's invasion were a period of political upheavals, caused both by internal dissension and by foreign invasions. It would therefore have been difficult to maintain records regularly. If this were the case some of the comparative deficiencies in this part of the Chronicle may be understood. One could be almost certain that much of the account of Parākramabāhu I was based on such records. It is inconceivable, for example, that the accounts of Parākramabāhu's campaigns in South India, containing such meticulous details, should have been written without the aid of the records of these events. In the account of Parākramabāhu I it is stated:

> 'Thereupon he ordered his skilled scribes to make an estimate of the King's revenues, of his stocks of grain, of his troops, of his various war materials and so on, with the charge: record these by stealing into the various departments of the administration.'[2]

---

[1] U.C.H.C., I, pt. I, 371-72; see L. S. Perera in Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon, edited by C. H. Philips, London, 1961, 36-37.

[2] Cv., LXVI, 154-55, there is also evidence of the maintenance of judicial records, Cv., XLIX, 20.

The statement in the Cūlavaṃsa that Vijayabāhu had seventeen years from the time he was yuvrāja 'chronicled in writing' also points to the prevalence of such a practice.[1] The same text informs us that Parākramabāhu I erected, among other edifices, one hundred and twenty-eight buildings for books (potthaka-mandira).[2] The bulk of the contents of these libraries may have been devoted to religious books, but there is no reason to believe that they were confined to such texts alone. These libraries, whatever may have been the nature of their contents, would have suffered under Māgha's attacks. Similarly, the records in the royal establishments like the lekam-gē would not have escaped the violence which characterised Māgha's invasion. If thus the records as well as the practice of maintaining them suffered in this period, as indeed it appears to have been, it may well be reflected in the subsequent continuation of the Pali Chronicle.

Another noteworthy feature in this part of the Cūlavaṃsa is that we get much more information on Māyārattha whereas the contrary is true of the previous parts. In the accounts of Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II, for example, we get a good deal

---

[1] Cv., LIX, 7.

[2] Cv., LXXIX, 80.

of information on their activities in this part of the island. But the information on Rājaraṭṭha and even on Rohaṇa is comparatively scarce, though it does contain useful information such as the location of Māgha's fortifications in Rājaraṭṭha and its condition when Parākramabāhu II succeeded in extending his control there after defeating Candrabhānu.[1] This may be partly due to the fact that the Sinhalese royal residences were located farther south at places like Daṃbadeṇiya and Yāpahuva, away from the ancient capitals in Rājaraṭṭha, and naturally greater information was available to them on Māyāraṭṭha. Besides, the latter region had risen in importance with the foundation of royal residences and, possibly, the movement of people from Rājaraṭṭha in these troubled times. On the other hand, this could be partly due to the possibility that Rājaraṭṭha could no longer be the centre according to the chronicler's view of the history of the island. In the older parts of the Pali Chronicle, naturally, the centre of interest was Rājaraṭṭa, though a considerable amount of information on other parts of the country, particularly Rohaṇa, appears in the narrative. In our period, too, the writers including the author of the Cūlavaṃsa look upon Rājaraṭṭha with respectful admiration and indeed call it the mūlarājadhāni.[2]

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIII, 15 ff; LXXXVIII, 77-102.

[2] Pjv., 131; Cv., LXXXVII, 66-70.

Even so, it appears that Rājaraṭṭha could no longer be the central point in his view of history. It is true that, despite the difficulties of communications in those days, one may find it difficult to believe that the people of the southern parts were not sufficiently aware of the developments in Northern Ceylon. As Rājaraṭṭha had been in occupation by foreign invaders for more than fifty years of the thirteenth century, it is not surprising that the writers of this period showed lack of precision in their accounts of Rājaraṭṭha. In spite of the availability of several other works of historical value in this period, the Pali Chronicle undoubtedly occupies the pride of place.

One noteworthy advantage to a student of the history of Ceylon in this period is that, apart from the Cūlavaṃsa, a number of contemporary works, which throw light on certain aspects of the island's history, are available to him. Among these works the Pūjāvaliya undoubtedly deserves special attention and is best considered along with the Cūlavaṃsa.[1] The Pūjāvaliya is a large work written in order to justify the epithet araham ('the worthy one') applied to the Buddha. The work consists of thirty four chapters, the last two of which are devoted to an outline of the history of Ceylon fromthe earliest times up to the end of the reign of Parākramabāhu II. The 34th chapter gives an account of the reigns of Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II,

---

[1] Ed. Bentara Śraddhā Tiṣya Thera, Pānadura, 1930.

the latter being treated with greater detail.[1]

The last two chapters are by far the most important for a student of history.[2] The preceding chapters may also be of considerable value in a study of social conditions. But the 33rd and 34th chapters are of much greater importance as they are devoted to a purely historical outline. Before we draw attention to its noteworthy features and its historical value it is necessary to consider its date and authorship.

The authorship of the Pūjāvaliya presents no difficulty and is well known as a work of Mayūrapāda Thera of the monastic college named Mayūrapāda Pirivaṇa at Vātagiri (Vākirigala), who lived in the reign of Parākramabāhu II as stated in the text.[3] This monastery was a flourishing institution in the times of Parakramabāhu II and received his patronage.4 The name Mayūrapada is mentioned in the list of writers who composed religious works, contained in the Nikāya Saṃgrahaya.[5] It is certain that the Pūjāvaliya was composed in the reign of Parākramabāhu II, but it is necessary to consider the date of the composition of the last two chapters, which, as stated earlier, are most relevant to our study, in the light of certain statements in

---

[1] Sinh. Lit., 61-66.

[2] Ed. A. V. Suravīra, Colombo, 1961.

[3] Pjv., 140-41.

[4] Cv., LXXXVIII, 43-47; Pjv., 134-35.

[5] Nks., 89.

the text concerning the date of its writing.

It is stated at the end of chapter xxxiv, that the Pūjāvaliya was composed in the thirtieth year (of the reign) of Parakramabāhu (mē pūjāvaliya nam dharmavyākhyānakathāva mē rajahaṭa tisvannehi upadavā). This reading is found in three printed editions of the text, but four of the manuscripts consulted by Suravīra in his edition do not contain it.[1] However, there is no reason to doubt this statement, which Suravīra too incorporates into his edition. According to it, the work was composed in the thirteith regnal year of Parākramabāhu II. For the thirtieth regnal year of Parākramabāhu II (1266) agrees very well with another statement found at the beginning of the same chapter (xxxiv), that a period of one thousand eight hundred and fifty-four years had elapsed from the attainment of the first Bodhi by the Buddha up to the end of his account of the homage paid to the Buddha by successive Sinhalese kings (apa mahā Gautama Budungē prathama Bodhiyehi paṭan māgē mē stuti pūjāvagē avasānayaṭa ekdahas aṭasiya sūpaṇas havuruddek atikrānta viya). This reading contained in the Śraddhā Tiṣya, Jinaratana and Medhaṃkara editions should be preferred to the reading in Suravīra's edition which is manifestly corrupt: apa mahā Gautamabudungē avasānayaṭa ekdahas aṭasiya sūpaṇas havuruddek atikrānta viya.[2] The latter omits the vital phrase

---

[1] Pjv., 141, note 2.

[2] Pjv., 82; Ed. Mābōpiṭiyē Medhaṃkara Thera, Colombo, 1932; Ed. Śraddhā Tiṣya Thera, Pānadura, 1930; (Ed. Huṃupiṭiyē Jinaratana, 1928).

prathama Bodhiyehi paṭan māgē mē stuti pujāvagē and therefore means 'One thousand eight hundred and fifty four years had elapsed up to the end of the Buddha'. There is good reason to believe that this reading is corrupt. In the first place the statement makes no sense, for it does not mention the event which it purports to date. Secondly in dating an event in this manner it is usual to refer to the Buddhavarṣa, Bodhi or Parinirvāṇa. It is extremely doubtful that the original text had the phrase Budungē avasānayaṭa ('to the end of the Buddha'). For,if that was meant one should expect the word Parinirvāṇa,and avasānaya simply means the end'. It is unusual for a Buddhist writer to refer to the death of the Buddha so casually, as in numerous Pali and Sinhalese writings the term employed to denote this event is Parinirvaṇa (Pali: Parinbbāna). The word avasānayaṭa clearly refers to the stutipūjā as is evident from the reading in the earlier editions. This is also clear from what follows in the text. It gives a list of 153 kings from Vijaya to Parākramabāhu II who ruled in Ceylon up to the date of the composition of his Pūjāvaliya. Though it may appear rather unusual to see this date being reckoned from the Bodhi and not from the Parinirvāṇa it should be noted that the author of the Pūjāvaliya follows the same practice in his Yōgārṇava, written some years later in the reign of Bhuvanekabahu I.[1] The Hatthavana-

---

[1]Ed. Kiriällē Ñāṇavimala, 1943, p.1.

gallavihāravaṃsa, another work written in the reign of Parākramabāhu II, dates the consecration of Parakramabāhu II from the Bodhi and not from the Parinirvāṇa.[1] A further argument in favour of the date being reckoned from the Bodhi is that it agrees with the statement at the end of chapter xxiv of the Pūjāvaliya that it was composed in the thirtieth year of Parakramabāhu (1266).[2]

It is thus quite clear that the Pūjāvaliya was composed in 1266. But does this imply that the entire work including chapters xxxiii and xxxiv was composed in that year? There is sufficient reason to believe that some additions, at least those to chapter xxxiv, were made later. Now we have noted the statement at the end of chapter xxxiv that the work was composed in the thirtieth year of Parākramabāhu. It is added that the Pūjāvaliya was sent to the king through his minister Devapatirāja and that the king received it with great honour.[3] But there is another statement in the same part of the narrative which refers to the upasampadā held at Dāstoṭa in the thirty-fifth year of the king and that the king was liṿing in Jambudroṇi engaging in meritorious activity and happy with the royal fortunes of his sons.[4] Simi-

---

[1] Hvv., 31.

[2] Pjv., 141.

[3] Pjv., 141.

[4] mesē pantis vannehi karana lada Vijayabāhu mālukam pūjāva hā samaga nava mālukam pūjāvak karavā tumū eya Jambudroṇi nam purayehi tava da vaḍa vaḍā putrayan vindiṃā śrī sampat bala balā tava da, vaḍa vaḍā pin rās koṭa rajasiri viṃdināha, Pjv., 140.

larly, the concluding portion of the same chapter, which gives the contents of each chapter in a summary form, refers to the 'end of (the of the reign of) Parākramabāhu' (Pärakum rajun avasanaṭa).[1] Quite obviously these statements are later additions, which were not found in the text when it was written in 1266.

Though these statements point to certain parts being added later, it does not follow that these two chapters were entirely new additions. The description of the contents and scope of the Pūjāvaliya in the concluding portion of chapter xxxiv refers to his work as consisting of thirty four chapters (sūtispariccheḍayakin), and in the summary of their contents both these chapters are again mentioned.[2] It seems very unlikely that the statement which gives the scope of the work as consisting of thirty-four chapters was added later. We are inclined to believe that the work consisted of thirty-four chapters when it was written in 1266, but a portion of chapter xxxiv which deals with the last years of the king was added later to complete the account. In favour of this view one may note that in all the four manuscripts consulted by Suravīra and in one printed text a considerable portion of the concluding part of chapter xxxiv is altogether missing.[3] There

---

[1] Pjv., 143.

[2] Pjv., 141.

[3] Pjv., 140, note 11.

the account ends with a statement that Parākramabāhu ruled thirty-two years and entrusted the kingdom to his elder son Vijayabāhu.[1] The reference to the duration of his reign as thirty-two years may be the result of the exclusion of the years in which Vijayabāhu had been entrusted with the kingdom, although in the missing portion referred to above the thirty-fifth year is mentioned.

There is a statement in the early part of chapter xxxiv that Parākramabāhu had the upasampadā ceremony performed in his third, sixth, eleventh, twelfth, seventeenth, twenty-first, twenty-seventh and thirtieth years, eight times in all, in order that he might 'reach (the saving shore) through the Noble Eight-fold Path'.[2] And in the concluding portion of the same chapter referred to above, reference is made to the upasampadā ceremony held at Dāstoṭa in his thirty-fifth year. This was by far the most important because it was held on a grand scale in its traditional site after his cherished consecration in Polonnaruva. Whatever be the significance of the reference to the Eight-fold Path in this context, it is noteworthy that the earlier statement has not taken into account the more important upasampadā ceremony held at Dāstoṭa but is mentioned as the ninth at the end of chapter xxxiv together with the statement that Parākramabāhu was living happily at Jambuddoṇi. It may be noted that the last upasampadā

---

[1] jyeṣṭha vū Vijayabāhu nam put raja haṭa rājyaya bhāra koṭa dī tumū detis avuruddak rajyaya kaḷaha, Pjv., 140, note 11.

[2] Pjv., 123.

ceremony according to the earlier statement, was held in the thirtieth year, which was also the date of the composition of the Pūjāvaliya. We have therefore good reason to believe that the concluding portion of chapter xxxiv, which is missing in Suravīra's manuscripts is a later addition.

The missing portion deals mainly with the king's activities in the last part of his reign such as the restoration of Anurādhapura and Polonnaruva, Parākramabāhu's consecration at the old capital, the restoration of the Tooth Relic to its shrine in Polonnaruva and the upasampadā ceremony held at Dāṣoṭa.[1] One may, however, note that this part also includes the account of the second invasion of Candrabhānu, which took place about the year 1262-3 as will be clear from our discussion of these events, and it could therefore have been included in the previous part as it was written in 1266. This need not be a strong objection, for it would not be surprising if the author could not include these events in his narrative which took place some three years prior to the date of its composition. Besides, it would not be unreasonable to assume that Mayūrapāda Thera was in some haste to complete his magnum opus and present it to the king who, it appears, was ailing and advancing in age. Once the work was completed he sent it to the king who received it with great joy and admiration. Thus any

---

[1] Pjv., 130-40, see note 11 on page 140.

omissions in the work concerning the events which immediately preceded the date of its composition is understandable.

There remains yet another question. If a part of the concluding chapter was added later, when was this additional portion incorporated into the text? Suravīra expressed the view that certain parts including the concluding portion referred to above were added to the text by a later writer following the Cūlavaṃsa account of Parākramabāhu II, on account of the close similarity of the two versions.[1] The relation between these two texts is unmistakable. In spite of the very close similarity of the two accounts, it is difficult to conclude that these parts were incorporated into the Pūjāvaliya on the basis of the Pali Chronicle. Such an incorporation of data from the Cūlavaṃsa, if it ever took place, has to be dated after the reign of Parakramabāhu IV, in or after whose reign this part of the Cūlavaṃsa appears to have been written. However, our impression is that these portions were added to the text either already towards the end of Parākramabāhu's reign or not long afterwards. It is possible that the author of the Pūjāvaliya added these sections himself to round off the account. One can rightly ask why the text at the end of it states that Parākramabāhu is living in Jambudroṇi enjoying royal splendour overjoyed with the royal fortunes of his sons devoting

---

[1] Pjv., pp. vi-vii.

himself to more and more meritorious deeds, after the performance of the ninth upasampadā ceremony by Vijayabāhu in the thirty-fifth year of the king.[1] Quite clearly, the king was then alive and the sentence is in the present tense. It is difficult to understand why this statement should have been made unless the account of Parākramabāhu's good deeds was completed. If any significance is to be attached to this statement one would be led to think that the account was completed almost in the king's last year. If it was added after the thirty-fifth year of Parakramabāhu, our impression is that the account was completed by the same author not long after the king's death. For, we know from the Yōgārnavaya, a medical treatise written by the same author, that Mayūrapāda Thera outlived his royal patron. The Yōgārnavaya was written by Mayūrapāda Thera in the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu I (1272-84), who succeeded to the throne after the brief two-year reign of Vijayabāhu IV, the son and successor or Parākramabāhu II, whose reign came to a tragic end.[2] There is thus no inherent difficulty in assuming that Mayūrapāda Thera himself completed the Pūjāvaliya account of Parākramabāhu II, either in his thirty-fifth year or a few years later, though it is by no means conclusive.

---

[1] mesē mē pantisvannehi karana lada Vijayabāhu mālukam pūjāva hā samaga nava mālukam pūjāvak karavā tumū eya Jambudroṇi nam purayehi tava da, vaḍā vaḍā putrayan viṁdinā śrī sampat bala balā tava da, vaḍa vaḍā pin rās koṭa rajasiri viṁdināha, Pjv., 140.

[2] Yōgārṇavaya, ed. Kiriällē Ñāṇavimala, 1943, p.1.

Suravīra has drawn attention to some aspects of the value of the Pūjāvaliya as a source of history.[1] It is the earliest extant Sinhalese work which purports to give a history of the island. In the first place its account of Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II is particularly noteworthy, for its author was an eye-witness of the events treated therein. Secondly, though the Pūjāvaliya account is less detailed than that of the Cūlavaṃsa, it contains the essence of the contents of the latter. The information on Māgha and Candrabhānu is valuable, coming as it does from a contemporary writer. It contains details of great importance which are not mentioned in the Cūlavaṃsa. For example, the reference to the regnal year of Parākramabāhu II (savisivana havurudu) in which his son Vijayabāhu and nephew Vīrabāhu entered Poḷonnaruva after defeating Candrabhānu has not only helped to date the defeat of the Jāvaka ruler, but also to confirm the chronology of the Pāṇḍyan invasions of Ceylon which took place during the reign of Parākramabāhu.[2] Similarly, the probable date of the defeat of Māgha has also been arrived at with the aid of a reference to the duration of the latter's occupation of Rājaraṭṭha in the Pūjāvaliya.[3] But the Pūjāvaliya like all other accounts which deal

---

[1] Pjv., 1-47; Sāhityaya (1958), 67-73.

[2] Pjv., 137; U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 628.

[3] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 620-21.

with the reign of Parākramabāhu II makes no mention of the Pāṇḍyan invasions.

In considering the historical value of the Pūjāvaliya, one has to take note of the close relations between its author Mayūrapāda Thera and his patrons. Mayūrapāda Thera undoubtedly enjoyed the patronage of Parākramabāhu.[1] The author states that it was written at the request of the prime minister Patirājadeva in order to promote the attainment of the Bodhisattva status by Parākramabāhu.[2] A more striking statement is found in the conclusion of his work. We are told that having completed his Pūjāvaliya the author sent it to the minister Devapatirāja, through whom it was presented to the king. It is added that on receipt of this work Parākramabāhu was so overjoyed as if a second kingdom had been bestowed upon him, and that he listened to its praise of the virtues of the Buddha during the period covered between two uposatha days, setting aside his royal duties. Further, we are told that the book was placed on the back of the royal elephant with banners flying and was taken round the city amidst great festivity.[3] These statements clearly show that Parākramabāhu had been

---

[1] Cv., LXXXVIII, 43-47.

[2] Pjv., ed. Bentara Śraddhā Tiṣya, 12, 13, 46.

[3] Pjv., 141.

greatly impressed by the Pūjāvaliya which thus won high royal favour. Perhaps the king's piety alone or the fact that it was purported to have been written to assist the king in the attainment of the Bodhisattva status does not adequately explain the exceptional personal interest shown by the king in the Pūjāvaliya. It is not unreasonable to hold that its author enjoyed the patronage of Parākramabāhu as is testified to by the Cūlavamsa, and that the eulogistic account of his reign which it contained - perhaps elaborated further some time later - led the king, partly at least, to bestow such distinct honour on the Pūjāvaliya. It should therefore not be surprising if its author tended to exaggerate at times the power and achievements of his patron. Where such exaggeration has been made it is often easy to detect, as will be shown in this study. Hence, it would hardly detract from its value as a source for a study of the times of Parākramabāhu II.

Another noteworthy point is that the Pūjāvaliya account of Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II, as well as that of other rulers agree well with that of the Cūlavamsa, with this difference that the latter is a more detailed version. But in many places the two accounts agree almost word to word.[1] This may be explained in either of two ways: either the authors of both these works drew from a common tradition or theauthor of this part of the Cūlavamsa had consulted

---

[1]Cf. Cv., LXXXV, 1-121 and Pjv., 119 ff.

the Pūjāvaliya, which was certainly available to him at the time when these chapters appear to have been written. We have referred to the possibility suggested by Suravīra that certain parts of the account of Parākramabāhu II might have been added by a later writer by following the Cūlavaṃsa. But then, how do we account for the similarity of the accounts of Māgha and his predecessors in Polonnaruva in the two works unless we assume that the entire chapter (xxxiv) is later than the Cūlavaṃsa? We have shown earlier the difficulty of accepting this proposition.

Although many editions of the Pūjāvaliya are now available, there is ample scope for an improved edition of this valuable text with critical annotations and a comparative study of its historical tradition. Such an edition should examine in detail the relation between the Pūjāvaliya and the Cūlavaṃsa accounts of the rulers of this period.

Among other contemporary works which contain information on the reign of Parākramabāhu II, the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa is of considerable importance.[1] As the title suggests, this work purports to give a history of the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra, a monastery situated in the Western Province, which tradition identifies as the site where king Saṃghabodhi of Anurādhapura, who abdicated his kingdom and re-

---

[1]Edited by C. E. Godakumbura, P.T.S., London, 1956.

tired to a life of meditation, donated his head to a poor wayfarer in order that the latter might get from Goṭhābhaya, his rival for the throne, the price set for securing Saṃghabodhi's head. It is now believed that the cremation of this pious king also took place at this vihāra, but on the authority of the Mahāvaṃsa-ṭīkā it has been rightly pointed out that that event took place to the South of the Issarasamaṇa-vihāra in Anurādhapura[1] and not in the present Attanagalla of the Western Province.

An excellent edition of this valuable text by Dr. C. E. Godakumbura appeared a few years ago. In its introduction, this scholar has drawn attention to the nature of the text, its language and contents and to its historical value.[2] He has also shown that this Pali text shows a very strong influence of the Sanskrit kāvya style reflected in works like the Jātakamālā.

The name of the author is not mentioned in the text, but the opening verses state that it was written at the request of Anomadassi, who is described as the Sabbayatirāja. In all probability this Anomadassi may be the dignitary of the same name who is described as a mahāsāmi in the Cūlavaṃsa. Parakramabāhu caused to be erected for him at the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra a three-storeyed pāsāda 'at great cost' through his minister Devapitirāja.[3] Parākramabāhu II took keen interest

---

[1] Paranavitana, U.C.H.C., I, pt. I, 190, note 26.

[2] see above, p. 48, note 1.

[3] Cv., LXXXVI, 37-39.

in this vihāra and effected repairs to its shrines in addition to the erection of a cetiya and an octagonal image house. There is thus good reason to believe that this Anomadassi Mahāsāmi for whom the king erected a costly pāsāda in addition to the building referred to above is the same as the Anomadassi who requested evidently one of his pupils to write a history of the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra of which he was the incumbent. The author of the Daivajñakāmadhenu, a Sanskrit work on astrology was also Anomadassi, to whom Goḍakumbura has indicated the possibility of ascribing the authorship of the Sinhalese grammar - Sidatsaṅgarāva - written in this period.[1] Whoever may have been the author of the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa, there is little doubt that it was written in the reign of Parākramabāhu II. The work ends with an account of the reign of Parākramabāhu II together with that of the contributions made by the latter and his father to the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra.[2] The concluding portion of this text contains a strophe in which the author expresses the wish that the history of the vihāra be continued by the addition of the names of the pious personages, who erect new edifices or repair the existing ones or make donations of fields etc. It is therefore reasonably clear, since the narrative ends with an account of the reign of Parākramabāhu II, and calls upon others to include the names

---

[1] Hvv., Introduction x.

[2] Hvv., Chapter 11, pp. 30-34.

of the future benefactors of the vihāra, that the work was composed in the reign of this monarch.

It is possible to determine the date of this work even more precisely. Godakumbura has pointed out that the author of the Pūjāvaliya quotes two stanzas from the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa. According to him, 'this fact enables one to conclude that the latter work existed before that date'.[1] This scholar has not, however, indicated that these stanzas could be later additions or were taken from a source common to both these works. We have seen earlier that the Pūjāvaliya was written in 1266 A.D. It would therefore appear that the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa is earlier in date than the Pūjāvaliya of 1266. In its account of the reign of Parākramabāhu II, the invasions of Candrabhānu are mentioned. Thès first invasion of Candrabhānu took place in 1247. This work, however, makes no distinction between two invasions, but as the death of Candrabhānu in battle is implied, it appears that the author of this work takes the second invasion into account. As shown in our discussion of Candrabhānu's invasions, the second invasion took place about the year 1261-2. It would therefore be reasonable to hold that the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa was written sometime between 1261-62 and 1266. Even if the lower limit is stretched further, it can be safely dated between 1247 and 1266.

---

[1] Hvv., Introduction, x.

As for its contents, eight of its eleven chapters are devoted to an account of the life of the pious king Sirisaṅghabodhi. Only the last two chapters deal with the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra and the endowments and contributions to it by successive Sinhalese kings. Consequently, it is more than a history of the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra. Apart from additional details such as the parentage of Sirisaṅghabodhi and the story that his queen followed him when he abdicated the throne to lead a life devoted to meditation and died of grief near the spot where her husband offered his head to a wayfarer, the story of this ruler follows the version given in the Mahāvaṃsa.[1] That its author followed earlier works is clear from a statement in the opening verses, to the significance of which the editor of this text has called attention, that the author was basing his work on 'stories based on history' (itihānugataṃ kathaṃ) and on 'former writings' (pubbalikhitaṃ). Godakumbura is inclined to believe that the latter may refer to the records found in the vihāra itself.[2]

Apart from the data on the life of Sirisaṅghabodhi useful information on some aspects of social conditions in medieval Ceylon can be gleaned from this part of the Hatthavangallavihāravaṃsa, though it need not necessarily apply to the times of Sirisaṅghabodhi, round

---

[1] Mv., XXXVI, 58ff.

[2] Hvv., Introduction, xiii.

whom the account is woven. For example, the graphic description of the funeral rites of Sirisaṅghabodhi and his queen given in chapter ix would be very valuable, for our knowledge of such interesting aspects of society is limited to the information contained in the principal Chronicles. The same part of the narrative goes on to record the reaction of the villagers when they saw the dead bodies of the king and his queen.

> 'The people of the neighbouring villages assembled and thought "It is not proper on our part either to touch the bodies of the consecrated king and his queen, or to carry out the funeral (rites) without informing the present king", and having erected a shed to ward off sun and rain and a fence to prevent animals from coming in they went away.'[1]

This passage brings out the sanctity of the royal person, particularly after consecration, according to the ideas of kingship prevalent in medieval Ceylon. The statement that the people considered it improper to perform the funeral rites without informing the reigning monarch is also noteworthy.

Attention may be drawn to another interesting passage. It is a statement put into the mouth of the wayfarer who was later to receive the head of Sirisaṅghabodhi - a statement not found in the Mahāvaṃsa account of this king. The wayfarer requested the king (though

---

[1] samīpagāmavāsino sannipatitvā: muddhâbhisitassa rañño ca mahesiyāsairaṃ amhādisehi phusituñ ca na yoggam, vattamānassa rañño anivedayitvā āḷāhanakiccam pi kātuṃ na yuttan sammannitvā vassātapanivāraṇāya kuṭiṃ katvā tiracchānappavesanisedhāya vatiñ ca katvā apakkamiṃsu, Hvv., 25, para 3, see also pp. 26-27.

he was not yet aware of the fact that he was the king) to partake of his portion of rice, but the king was reluctant to do so. Then the wayfarer addressed the king in these words:

> '"I am not of low birth. I am not a fisherman, nor am I a hunter making a living by destroying life. On the other hand I am born into a family worthy of being associated with by the high castes. Good Sir, it befits you to partake of my rice" - thus he entreated over and over again.'[1]

The Sinhalese versions of this text of a later date convey the sense of this passage in much the same way but for slight elaborations. To the list of those who live by taking others' life is added the Padu, a social division in Ceylon today, whose present occupations, however, are not reminiscent of the memory reflected in this text. Uttamavanna of the Pali text is given in the Sinhalese versions as cāturvaṇayan, possibly a reference to the 'four castes'. But this term may signify the social order in general, rather than the fourfold Indian division.[2]

We need not over-estimate the importance of these passages; nor is it possible to examine them here. But they may be certainly useful to a student of the social institutions of medieval Ceylon. It is noteworthy that this passage occurs in a work in which the author takes pains to mention that Anomadassi Thera who requested him to write this work was of a Brāhmaṇa lineage.[3] The author of the Pūjāvaliya has also

---

[1] atha so puriso: nâhaṃ nihīnajātiyaṃ jāto na pāṇavadhajīvikāya jīvanto kevaṭṭo vā luddako vā bhavāmi, atha kho uttamavaṇṇehi paribhogârahe vaṃse sañjāto'mhi mama santakaṃ idaṃ bhattaṃ bhottuṃ arahati kalyāṇadhammikā ti taṃ punappuna yāci, Hvv., 23, para 1.

[2] Ēlu Av., Ed. Rā. Tennakōn, Colombo, 1946, 53.

[3] Hvv., p.1, strophe 3.

set down the details of his respectable lineage at the conclusion of his work.[1] Similarly, there are other monks who wrote literary works in this period and have provided us with their family background in terms of caste divisions such as Brāhmaṇa or Vaiśya to which they trace their origins.[2] We drew attention to these passages in order to illustrate the value of these literary texts for a study of the social conditions of this period.

So far as we are concerned, what is of significance to us in the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa is its account of the reigns of Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II. Since this work belongs to a date earlier than that of the Pūjāvaliya it may well be the earliest datable account of the reign of Parakramabāhu II. Therefore its account, though not so detailed as that of the Pūjāvaliya, is nevertheless of considerable value. The opening passages of Chapter XI which precedes the account of the reign of Vijayabāhu III give a graphic description of the political confusion which prevailed on the eve of Māgha's invasion.[3] This text gives us the name of Vijayabāhu's father as Vijayamalla, a detail not mentioned in any other source. The foundation of Daṃbadeniya as a royal residence, the recovery of the Tooth

---

[1] Pjv., 140-41.

[2] See colophon of the Saddharmālaṅkāraya, ed. Śraddhā Tiṣya, Pānadura, 1934; Shd. Rtn., 532-33.

[3] Hvv., 30, para 1.

Relic and the Alms Bowl, and the construction of the Tooth Relic Temple (at Beligala) by Vijayabāhu III are mentioned together with a reference to his services to Buddhism in general and to the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra in particular.[1]

More important information is available on the reign of Parākramabāhu II. This text mentions two important details not given in other literary works of the period. It gives the exact year of the consecration of Parakramabāhu II reckoned from the Bodhi, which has helped to establish the date of the accession of this monarch to the throne. The other important detail that Candrabhānu invaded Ceylon from Tāmbraliṅga country (Tambaliṅgaviṣaya), to which Paranavitana called attention, brings confirmation from a Ceylonese source that he was a ruler of the kingdom of Tāmbraliṅga in the Malay Peninsula as known from the Jaiyā Inscription where Candrabhānu is mentioned as the Lord of Tāmbraliṅga (Tāmbraliṅgeśvara).[2] The account of Candrabhānu in the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa is valuable as it sheds light on these events about which a student of the islands history would like to know much more. This is not to suggest that its account of Candrabhānu's power and resources should be accepted at its face value, though there is no reason to doubt that he was a ruler who possessed

---

[1] Hvv., 30-31, para 2.

[2] Hvv., 31-32, para 3-7.

considerable resources. The reference, however casual, to the political conditions in Rājaraṭṭha is similarly helpful. It also refers to the construction of the Tooth Relic Temple and the homage paid to the Relic by Parākramabāhu II together with an account of the miracle which this Relic is said to have performed as given in other works like the Pūjāvaliya and the Cūlavaṃsa.[1] Another interesting passage is found in the account of the construction of a vaṭṭulaghara (Sinh. vaṭageya) by Goṭhābhaya at the site where Sirisaṅghabodhi is said to have been cremated. He called his ministers and said:

> 'It is possible for me now to construct a many-storeyed and very large golden Circular (Relic) Shrine; in that case it will not last in the future for want of occupants; invaders may destroy it on account of their greed for gold (wealth). Therefore it is fitting that I cause to be built without delay a vaṭṭulaghara and a cetiya in it, which would be sufficiently comfortable for the occupants but not in such a way as to be coveted by others.'[2]

This statement which refers to the destruction of shrines by invaders who coveted their wealth, and the desolation of monasteries, though attributed to the reign of Goṭhābhaya, is most likely to reflect the conditions of the times of the author in which the country was repeatedly invaded. But the possibility that it may refer to earlier times should not be ruled out.

---

[1] Hvv., 31, para 3; Cv., LXXXII; Pjv., 113 ff.

[2] etarahi anekabhūmakaṃ ativisālaṃ kanakamayavaṭṭulagharaṃ sakkā, āyati parihārakānaṃ abhāvena nappavattati, raṭṭhavilopakāpi suvaṇṇalobhena naseti, tasmā alobhanīyaṃ sukhapariharāraham pamāṇayuttaṃ vaṭṭulagharañ ca cetiyañ ca nacirass'eva kātuṃ yuttan ti, Hvv., 26-27, para 6.

The account ends with a description of the contributions to the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra by Parākramabāhu II both personally and through his minister Devapatirāja, by way of restoring the existing edifices and by erecting various other new buildings such as residences, image-houses and so forth and by providing for the maintenance of their inmates.

That the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa enjoyed a high degree of popularity is evident from the fact that it was translated into Sinhalese twice in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries respectively. The first translation is dated in the Śaka year 1304 (1382 A.D.) during the reign of Parākramabāhu V (1360-91) of Gampoḷa. The translator is not named, but it is stated that the translation was undertaken at the request of a minister named Śatṛsiṃha Kuñjara.[1] The second translation is said to have been undertaken by an (un-named) pupil of the reputed Vīdāgama Maitrī Thera at the request of Parākramabāhu VI of Kōṭṭe.[2] Indeed to this day the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa enjoys a high reputation in the traditional centres of learning.

Though the Sinhalese versions are not word to word translations of the Pali text, they are generally faithful to the original. Certain modifications, however, can be detected. In Chapter X we are told that

---

[1] Eḷu Attanagaluvaṃsaya, ed. D. D. Karuṇātilaka, Kāgalla, 1923.

[2] Eḷu Av., ed. Rä. Tennakōn, Colombo, 1954.

in Malayadesa there were certain robbers (corā) who had gathered round them a following and were in the habit of plundering villages and rich monasteries whereby they had not only become rich, but were exercising their authority in that province disregarding royal authority in the time of Moggallāna, one of the kings of that name of Anurādhapura. (...Malayadesavāsino keci corā ekato hutvā gāmavilopaṃ katvā mahantena dhanalābhena mattā dhanaṃ datvā balakāyaṃ uppādetvā yebhuyyena sabbaṃ janapadaṃ hatthagataṃ rājūnaṃ balañ ca abhibuyya serino hutvā...)[1] This passage together with its continuation illustrates evidently a notable political phenomenon of the times of Parākramabāhu II, though it is projected on to the time of Moggallāna of Anurādhapura. What we wish to point out is that for the Pali words keci corā (some robbers), the translators substituted samahara siri vanni kenek using more explicit terminology from the politics of the time of these authors.[2] The terms Vannirāja and Vanni occur for the first time in the Cūlavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya in their accounts of Viḷayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II and later in the Sandeśa poems as vanni niriṅdu, but as time went on vanni kings (forest chieftains) must have become more numerous and they are frequently mentioned in the Sandeśa poems of the fifteenth century referred to above.[3] The sense

---

[1] Hvv., 28, para 3.

[2] Ḷlu Av., 65.

[3] Girāsandeśaya, ed. Makuluḍūvē Piyaratana, Colombo, 1948, verse 140; Pārakumbā Sirita, ed. Amarasiri Guṇavardhana, Colombo, 1953, verses 28, 46; Pjv., 116, 139; Cv., LXXXI, 10-11.

of the phrase rājūnam balañ ca abhibhuyya is retained in the Sinhalese: rajadaruvangē ājñāva da mäda, but an additional word, svēcchāçārīvä (independent) is inserted into the Sinhalese text for which the original contains no corresponding Pali word.[1] Similarly, the same chapter of the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa refers to a king named Upatissa who visited the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra on hearing that a thera attained Arhatship there. He is said to have erected amongst other edifices a five-storeyed residence and made endowments to the vihāra.[2] The name Upatissa may refer to one of the kings of that name who ruled from Anurādhapura. While the Pali text does not mention this fact the Sinhalese versions add that he came from Anurādhapura and returned to that city after his visit to the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra.[3]

These slight modifications and additions in the Sinhalese versions can be instructive in certain instances. But there is a danger in relying on such details in arriving at vital conclusions. For example, the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa states that the consecration of Parākramabāhu II took place after the lapse of one thousand eight hundred and twenty four years after the Bodhi.[4] This date of the conse-

---

[1] Elu Av., 65.

[2] Hvv., 28, para 1-2.

[3] Elu. Av., 64-5.

[4] Hvv., 31, para 3.

cration of this ruler isconfirmed by other sources such as the Devundara Inscription set up by the same monarch.[1] In the Sinhalese versions, however, the important detail concerning the exact event from which this date is reckoned is not given, but we are simply told that his consecratinn took place in the year one thousand eight hundred and twenty four of the Buddhist era (srī Buddhavarṣayen ekdahas aṭasiya sūvisi havuruddak ikma giya kalhi).[2] The omission of the reference to Bodhi is a detail, but it makes a difference of 45 years, for, according to the Sinhalese versions the date has to be reckoned from Parinirvāṇa, which is the starting point of the Buddhist era in normal practice. It is well known that the Parinirvāṇa took place forty five years after the Bodhi. Consequently, while the date of Parākramabāhu's consecration falls in 1236 according to the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa, the omission of the reference to Bodhi in the Sinhalese versions would place it in 1281 - an impossible date for that event. Similarly, while the Pali text informs us that the fire of the funeral pyre of Sirisaṅghabodhi was extinguished on the second day (dutiyādivase), the Sinhalese versions would have us believe that it took place on the third day (tunvana davashi).[3] It is therefore reasonable to bear in mind that though

---

[1] A.S.C.Mem., VI, 69; Sinh. Sā. Lipi, 67.

[2] Elu Av., 69.

[3] Hvv., 26, para 6; Elu Av., 62.

the additions and modifications in the Sinhalese versions are not without value, the pride of place has understandably to be given to the original text in determining issues of vital importance.

Another important work which dates from the reign of Parākramabāhu II is the Daṁbadeṇi Katikāvata, the edict containing the code of disciplinary rules for the Saṃgha promulgated by the synod held under the patronage of this monarch with a view to eliminating the abuses which had crept into the discipline of the Buddhists monks. The text of this edict, however, is not preserved in the form of an epigraph as in the case of that issued in the reign of Parākramabāhu I. The text of the Daṁbadeṇi Katikāvata has come down to us in ola leaf manuscripts, and has been edited by Sir D. B. Jayatilaka together with the texts of other similar edicts in his Katikāvat Saṁgarā.[1] This katikāvata refers to the 'purification' of the Saṃgha effected during the reign of Vijayabāhu III headed by the respective heads of the Vanavāsī (forest-dwelling) and the Grāmavāsī (village dwelling) fraternities such as Saṃgharakkhita and Medhaṅkara. The reference to the defeat of foreign invaders both by Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II, and the statement that the members of the Saṃgha fled to Māyāraṭṭha for protection when Rājaraṭṭha was sacked by the Tamils are of considerable interest. In addition, this part of the text also gives a brief account of the services rendered to Buddhism

---

[1] Ktk. Sng. (Reprinted) Kälaṇiya, 1955, 6-20.

by these two kings.[1]

By far the greatest value of this document lies in the portion which contains the rules of discipline for the Buddhists monks, enacted by the assembly of monks headed by such eminent theras as Medhaṅkara Mahāsāmi who is described as the Sāsanānusāsaka. It gives a vivid picture of the abuses which had crept into the Saṃgha. This katikāvata undoubtedly forms an indispensable source for a study of the condition of the Saṃgha in the times of Parākramabāhu II.[2]

A number of works which set out the history of the Tooth Relic were written from time to time. These works contain information which is primarily concerned with the history of Buddhism in general, and of the Tooth Relic in particular. Nevertheless, they provide useful information on political matters. The nature of the contents of these works, their language and authorship, have been discussed by previous writers.

The first in this group of works is the Pali Dāṭhāvaṃsa, written by Dharmakīrtti during the reign of queen Līlāvatī at the request of her Prime Minister Parākrama, who is also mentioned in the Cūlavaṃsa as one who had been instrumental in raising her to the throne.[3] This author makes complimentary references to queen Līlāvatī. Dharmakīrtti

---

[1] Ktk. Sng., 6-9.

[2] Ktk. Sng., 9-20.

[3] Dāṭhāvaṃsa, ed. Āsabha Tissa Thera, Kälaṇiya, 1883; Cv., LXXX, 49-50.

states that his work was based on an older Daḷadāvaṃsa 'written in the language of the land'. The latter is no longer extant. The Dāṭhāvaṃsa gives certain details which are of interest for a study of the reign of Līlāvatī. It gives an outline of the life of the Buddha followed by an account of his visits to Ceylon which are also recounted in the Mahāvaṃsa. Then it goes on to deal with the war that ensued between king Paṇḍu of Pāṭalīputra and king Guhasīva of Kaliṅga on account of the Tooth Relic which the latter possessed, and the circumstances which led to the bringing of the Relic to Ceylon by Dantakumāra, nephew of Guhasīva and his spouse Hemamālā, on the defeat of the Kaliṅga king. The work ends with the arrival of the Relic in Ceylon in the ninth regnal year of Sirimeghavaṇṇa who paid great homage to it.

In this account there are a few details which are of considerable interest for the early history of Ceylon. The most important detail is the reference to the existence of friendly relations between Guhasīva and Mahāsena, who was his contemporary in Ceylon. Guhasīva is stated to have instructed his nephew that, in the event of his defeat, the Relic should be taken to the island of Laṅkā. It was added that Mahāsena who ruled in Ceylon having unified it was a friend of his who would welcome the Relic and provide him with befitting maintenance.[1]

---

[1] Dāṭhāvaṃsa, p.74, vv.300-02. Daḷ. S., 30.

v. 300-302

At first sight one may not attach much significance to this alleged relation between Mahāsena and the Kaliṅga king as it is mentioned in a twelfth-century work which is far removed from these events. But there are considerations which may give this statement some degree of validity. Firstly, we must not ignore the claim made by the author of the Dāṭhāvaṃsa that his work was based on the older Daḷadāvaṃsa. The Cūlavaṃsa in its first part makes reference to a Chronicle of the Tooth Relic and, if we accept Sirima Wickramasinghe's arguments that this part of the Cūlavaṃsa was composed during the Coḷa occupation of Ceylon in the eleventh century, which appear to us sufficiently convincing, then we have to accept that there was a Chronicle of the Tooth Relic before Dharmakīrtti wrote his Dāṭhāvaṃsa, though we cannot be certain whether this is the work meant by Dharmakīrtti when he refers to the Chronicle of the Tooth Relic 'written in the language of the land'.[1] There is no valid reason to doubt that Dharmakīrtti based his work on ancient tradition though it cannot be ruled out that additions were made in his poem. Prof. G. P. Malalasekara refers to Turnours remarks that this old Sinhalese poem was extant as late as 1837.[2] At present, however, no manuscripts of this work are found. And we do not know whether Turnour confused this text with the later versions written in Sinhalese verse, present in

---

[1] Dāṭhāvaṃsa., Cv., XXXVII 93; Daḷ. S., 41.

[2] Pali Lit., Cey. 208.

manuscripts and noted by Godakumbura in his Sinhalese Literature.[1]

Whatever may be the case, we do not know how far Dharmakīrtti was faithful to the older Daḷadāvaṃsa, but there is no valid reason to suspect that this author inserted the reference to friendly relations between Mahāsena and Guhasīva. It is most probable that this detail was found in the old Sinhalese poem. There are other reasons why the relations of Mahāsena with the Kaliṅga ruler should not be dismissed as improbable. By the time the Relic arrived in Ceylon Mahāsena was dead and his son had succeeded to the throne. It is significant that Chinese evidence, which was brought to light by Sylvain Lévi, refers to an embassy to the court of Samudra Gupta sent by Sirimeghavaṇṇa (Chi-mi-kia-po-mo) in order to secure facilities for Ceylonese pilgrims to the Bodhi Tree. At this site a Sanskrit inscription refers to the foundation of a shrine by a sthavira Mahānāma of Laṅkā which, it is believed, is connected with this embassy.[2] Saiṃhala is also mentioned in Samudra Gupta's Allahabad Prasasti.[3] The details of this embassy sent by Sirimeghavaṇṇa need not concern us here. Suffice it to note that at this time Mahāsena's son and successor maintained relations with distant Indian

---

[1] Sinh.Lit., 115-16.

[2] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXIV, No. 68, 75 ff; Corpus Inscriptionun Indicarum, III, 274-79; Vincent Smith, Indian Antiquary, XXXI.

[3] Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, III, 8.

territories. It is unlikely that this was an altogether new development, and it would not be surprising if Mahāsene had been in contact with a ruler in Kaliṅga, who had in his possession the venerated Tooth Relic. There are some indications in the accounts of Mahāsena which may be put forward in support of this hypothesis.

It is well known that Mahāsena accepted Vetulla doctrines, after being influenced by Saṃghamitta who came over to Ceylon and was in charge of his education during the reign of his father. His ardent attachment to Vetulla teachings led to a conflict with the orthodox Mahāvihāra.[1] It has been shown that Mahāyāna was making progress in the Andhra Pradesh during this period.[2] The development of sculpture in Ceylon in this period bears the unmistakable influence of Amarāvatī and other centres in that area.[3] Some specimesnf of sculpture found in Ceylon are indeed considered to have been imported from that region.[4] One may alsonote that Paranavitana, while drawing attention to these points, indicates the possibility that even the particular variety of stone on which Mahāsene engraved an inscription in which he blames the inmates of the Five

---

[1] Mv., XXXVII.

[2] See J.N.Banerjea in U.C.H.C., I, pt. I, 203-205.

[3] U.C.H.C., I, pt. I, 264-67.

[4] Paranavitana, U.C.H.C., I, pt. I, 266; A.S.C.A.R., 1952, 24.

Great Residences, evidently of the Mahāvihāra, for lack of discipline, may have been imported from that region.[1] In any case, it is beyond doubt that Ceylon had relations with the Buddhist centres in Andhra Pradesh, as is confirmed by epigraphic evidence from Nāgārjunikoṇḍa datable in this period.[2]

It is also striking that Sirimeghavaṇṇa decreed that the Tooth Relic be taken to the Abhayagiri Vihāra every year, a practice which was followed in the fifth century when the Chinese pilgrim Fa-hien visited Ceylon. The Mahāvihāra, which one might have expected to have a stronger claim on the venerated Relic, does not figure prominently in connection with its reception or the celebrations connected with it.[3] In the first part of the Cūḷavaṃsa we do not find information on the Tooth Relic consistent with the importance of this Relic, testified to by Fa-hien. One therefore suspects that Mahāsena's interest in this Relic resulted from its closer association with the Abhayagiri Vihāra which received his patronage and the evident lack of enthusiasm on the part of the Mahāvihāra.

In the light of these considerations, the Dāṭhāvaṃsa tradition of Mahāsena's relations with Kaliṅga appears to rest on some valid foundation. At any rate we should not hasten to dismiss it as a later

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., IV, No. 36, 274.

[2] Ep. Ind., XX, 22.

[3] Cv., XXXVII, 97; Dal. S., 41; The Travels of Fa-Hsien, Reprinted, London, 1959, 70-71.

tradition. There is however one objection which may be raised against attaching much significance to the Dāṭhāvaṃsa tradition. We have noted earlier Guhasīva's instructions to take the Relic to Ceylon in the event of his defeat in the war. Guhasīva refers to Mahāsena as the ruler of Ceylon at the time but, when the fugitives arrived in Ceylon with the Tooth Relic, Mahāsena was dead and his successor Sirimeghavaṇṇa had reached his ninth regnal year. We do not know how long the war lasted, but it appears that Guhasīva was not aware of Mahāsena's death. Though this may be a serious objection to the validity of this tradition Ceylon's relations with Kaliṅga appear to rest on a valid foundation.

We made this digression in order to illustrate the indirect value of works other than the principal Pali Chronicle in our understanding of problems connected with the early history of Ceylon, though they should not be preferred to the Mahāvaṃsa without adequate independent testimony.

The Daḷadāsirita, written in the Śaka year 1240 (1318 A.D.) by a dignitary referred to as Devradadampasaṅgināvan in the reign of Parākramabāhu IV is a Sinhalese work which follows the Dāṭhāvaṃsa. It gives essentially the same account of the bringing of the Tooth Relic to Ceylon as that of the Pali poem. This work also contains a brief historical sketch up to the time of Parākramabāhu IV with special reference to the services rendered by them to the Relic together with the rules of conduct to be followed in connection with the Tooth Relic. Here again, many aspects of this text, such as the significance of the

title of the book as well as that of its author, and its language have been discussed previously, notably by Soràta Thera in his edition of the text, with a useful introduction and glossary.[1] We therefore confine outselves to the value of its historical information.

This work gives a list of kings from Kittisirimegha with brief notices of their contributions to Buddhism up to the reign of Parākramabāhu IV. It gives a traditional list of twelve great poets who flourished in the time of Aggabodhi. This account is considerably elaborated from the reign of Vijayabāhu III. The chief events of this ruler and those of Parākramabāhu II are dealt with, though it adds little to what we know of these rulers from the Pūjāvaliya.[2] The invasions of Candrabhānu are not recorded but the arrival in Ceylon of Dharmakīrtti Thera from Tamalimgamu is mentioned. The tradition that Māgha persecuted Buddhism is preserved. The historical outline ends with an account of the reign of Parākramabāhu IV couched in eulogistic terms. Though it adds little new to our knowledge, it should be of some value for a study of the reigns of Parākramabāhu IV and his immediate predecessors.

The concluding portion of the work, which deals with the rules of conduct towards the Tooth Relic from which this text seems to derive its title, is of great value to a student of history. Not only the procedure of the observances but also how kings should conduct

---

[1] Colombo, 1955, see Introduction, xxxi-lxi.

[2] Dal.S., 41-46.

themselves in connection with the Relic is given.[1] We may cite a few of these rules by way of illustration. When kings enter the Temple of the Tooth Relic once a day, they should leave their retinue outside and enter it tidy and with reverence', clean the floor with a broom themselves before they pay homage.[2] When kings go into occupation of a new palace, the Tooth Relic should be brought in along with the Samgha who will recite the Paritta and sprinkle the sacred water (piritpän) before it is occupied.[3] Immunity shall be given to those who enter the temple for sanctuary.[4] Not even a karsāpana shall be appropriated by the palace; even if the pälace draws (from the temple resources) in times of adversity (nosaruveka) it should be returned with interest within six months.[5] This practice is also known from South Indian temple administration.[6] In times of drought homage should be paid to the Tooth Relic.[7] A study of

---

[1] Dal.S., 46-54.

[2] Sirilaka raja pämini dähämin yut maha rajun visin davasa vitak Daladāgeta gos vandanā kala siyalu pirivara piṭata raňdavā pirisuduvā adara buhuman ätivā geta vāda musun gena geya ämädä at deva ruvan hā mal ädiya pudā,....., Dal.S., 50.

[3] rajadaruvan māligā pravesa vana kala palamu Daladāpātradhātūnvahansē vadā mahasaňgana lavā pirit karavā pirit pän isvā arak kärä tunuruvanata pūjā kota pravesa vanuva isā, Dal.S., 51.

[4] Kisiyam bayekin Daladāgeta vannavunta gahatayak nokaranuva isā, Dal.S., 53.

[5] Daladāgen kahavanuvak vicarakut rajageta no gannāva isā, idin nosaruveka gata samasak ätulata diyunā perala denuya isā, Dal.S, 53.

[6] A.R.E., Nos. 262 and 266 of 1921.

[7] väsi novasnā kala mema lesin Dalada pūjā karanuva isā, Dal.S. 53.

these rules would undoubtedly be instructive. Ir would be interesting to examine how far the present day observances connected with the Relic follow those laid down in the Daḷadā sirita.

Like certain other works cited earlier, the Daḷadāsirita provides information on other aspects of society apart from the history and observances connected with the Tooth Relic. To cite one example, the list of musical instruments given in this text, particularly that of the wide variety of drums which figures in the description of the ceremonies in the Tooth Relic Temple can be instructive to a student of the history of the musical arts in Ceylon, an aspect on which little is known.[1] The distinct influence of Tamil in some of the terminology in this list is also interesting.

Another Sinhalese work devoted to a history of the Tooth Relic is the Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya.[2] In the opening passage it is stated that its author's purpose in writing this work was to enable the three Prime Ministers, Alagakkōnāra, Patirāja and Jayasiṃha to gain merit. A king named Bhuvanekabāhu is also mentioned together with these ministers. As the ministers mentioned there are those of Bhuvanekabāhu V of Gampoḷa, Godakumbura suggests that the Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya may have been composed in the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu V of Gampoḷa.[3] It may,

---

[1] Dal. S., 49.

[2] Edited by Kanadullē Ratanaraṃsi Thera, Colombo, 1954.

[3] Sinh. Lit., 114-15.

however, be noted that in its historical sketch of the kings of Ceylon the author makes no reference to the kings who followed Parākramabāhu IV up to Bhuvanekabāhu V.

The Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya covers much the same ground as the Daḷadāsirita, but as pointed out by Godakumbura it has drawn from other works like the Mahāvaṃsa, Jinacarita.[1] The list of the officers of Parākramabāhu I is the same as that given in the Nikāya-saṃgrahaya.[2] The historical outline at the end of the work, which is brief and incomplete compared with that of the Daḷadāsirita, is not of direct value to our study though it does contain a few details. Among them may be mentioned the reference to Vijayabāhu III as Paḷābatgala Vijayabāhu Vathimi Raja,[3] a tradition not mentioned in the Cūlavaṃsa or the Pūjāvaliya. Parākramabāhu I is referred to by the title Kalikāla Sāhitya Sarvajña which, as far as we know, was a title of Parākramabāhu II. Similarly, his parentage is definitely attributed to Kīrttisrīmegha in accordance with the Pūjāvaliya.[4] The list of Parākramabāhu's successors is incomplete. Apart from this, this work contains certain traditions not mentioned in other sources. We are told that in the latter part of the reigns of the kings who belonged to the Cūlavaṃsa the Coḷas invaded Ceylon and ruled

---

[1] Sinh. Lit., 114-15.

[2] Daḷ. Pjv., 62; Nks., 85.

[3] Daḷ. Pjv., 64.

[4] Daḷ. Pjv., 59.

for a time and carried away the Tooth Relic and the minibera. A king named Silu Sirisaṅgabō assembled his forces at Māvatutoṭa, invaded the Cola country and returned with the Relic and the minibera.[1] The Cūlavamsa which gives a fairly detailed account of these Cola invasions does not say that the Tooth Relic was ever taken away by them. Nor is it possible to identify the Sinhalese king who is credited with the recovery of the Tooth Relic. The authenticity of this tradition, however interesting it may be, is doubtful. This account immediately afterwards refers to Gajabāhu's invasion of the Cola country - a tradition elaborated in later Sinhalese writings but not mentioned in the Mahāvamsa. Gajabāhu is credited in this text with invasion of the Cola country, and it is stated that he returned to Ceylon with the Tooth Relic.[2] If the former reference is to the time of the Cola occupation of Ceylon, then one can easily see the conspicuous confusion of chronology. For Gajabāhu ruled many centuries prior to Cola occupation. Further, no other work mentions that the Tooth Relic was taken away by the Colas. Hence it would be difficult to give much credit to these traditions which appear to have grown up in later times, in the absence of confirmation by other sources.

In addition to the works devoted to the history of the Tooth

---

[1] Dal. Pjv., 58.

[2] Dal. Pjv., 59; Pjv., 93; Rjv., 34-35.

Relic so far considered mention may be made of another Sinhalese work called the Daḷadāvaṁsaya which brings its account up to the reign of Kīrttisrī Rājasiṁha.[1] Godakumbura has noted two other works on the history of the Tooth Relic, still in manuscripts, written in Sinhalese verse. Of these two one is the Daḷadahaṭana written in the Saka year 1615 (1793 A.D.). They are said to cover approximately the same ground as the works considered above.[2]

The Dambadeni Asna is a Sinhalese work which deserves mention in this survey.[3] It mentions the foreign invasions which took place during the reign of Parākramabāhu II. These events are narrated with obvious exaggerations and their confusion will be shown in our discussion of these events. A great deal of caution is necessary in utilizing its data for the reconstruction of the political aspects of the reign of Parākramabāhu II. In spite of these limitations, the Daṁbadeni Asna can be of considerable value for a study of the social conditions and certain aspects of political life in medieval Ceylon. It gives a long list of functionaries engaged in various types of service to the court. Similarly, it contains a list of the different sections of the army. The weapons of war, particularly a large variety

---

[1] Ed. Sārānaṁa Thera, 1916.

[2] Sinh. Lit., 116.

[3] Kuveni Sihabā saha Daṁbadeni Asna, ed. Kiriällē Ñāṇavimala, Colombo, 1960, 30-39.

of arrows, are mentioned apart from a list of royal ornaments. This work also gives a list of musical instruments. Here again some caution is necessary in handling these data. The Tamil influence on this text is unmistakable and some passages are hardly distinguishable from Tamil.[1]

The Dambadeni Asna ends with the mention of the names of Parākramabāhu (II), Bhuvanekabāhu Vathimiraja and Parākramabāhu, each being referred to as the son of his predecessor. There is no way of determining its authorship. But as Godakumbura has pointed out, if it was composed in the reign of Parakramabāhu IV, one should expect an account of his reign, too. This scholar believes that the names of kings appended to the work are an addition by a later scribe.[2]

Another interesting work useful to a student of the reign of Parākramabāhu II is the Kaṅdavurusirita, published by Sir D. B. Jayatilaka in his Simhala Sāhitya Lipi, based on a manuscript in the British Museum.[3] The contents of this document have been utilized by Paranavitana in the section on the political conditions of this period appearing in the History of Ceylon.[4] It gives the daily routine of Kalikāla Sāhitya Sarvajña Paṇḍita Parākramabāhu (Parākramabāhu II).

---

[1] Dmb.A., 32.

[2] Sinh. Lit., 110.

[3] Sinh. Sā.Lipi, 63-66.

[4] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 727 ff.

Though it refers to the Brāhmaṇas and Brāhmaṇical practices at the court, a compromise with Buddhist ways has been made. We are told that the king begins his day with meditation on anicca, dukkha and anātma followed by concentration on the suttas. The king is also said to observe the sīla and pay homage to the Tooth Relic as part of the daily routine.[1] Though this work purports to give the daily routine of Parākramabāhu II, one may yet wonder whether this reflects the ideal expected of a king rather than his actual routine. Godakumbura has indeed pointed out that the practices enumerated in it resemble those given in the Manunīti on royal conduct.[2] But this does not detract from its value for a study of the role of the king in the administration of medieval Ceylon. The author of this work is not mentioned in the text, but it appears to have been composed in the reign of Parākramabāhu II, or not long afterwards.

Among other works which have a direct bearing on the reign of Parākramabāhu II attention may be drawn to a document entitled the Alutnuvara Dēvālaya Karavīma, preserved in the British Museum.[3] A part of this document was published by Sir D. B. Jayatilaka in his Siṃhala Sāhitya Lipi.[4] As far as we know, other manuscripts of this

---

[1] Sinh. Sā. Lipi., 63-64.

[2] Sinh. Lit., 111.

[3] British Museum Library, Manuscript No. Or. 6606 (145).

[4] Sinh. Sā. Lipi, 67-68.

work are not available; at least it is not mentioned in the Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Temple Libraries of Ceylon compiled by K. D. Sōmadāsa.[1] The published portion relating to the Äsaḷa festival at Devinuvara, where the date of this work is not discussed, may create the impression that it was written in the reign of Parākramabāhu II. But this is extremely doubtful.

Here we will mainly confine ourselves to the information it contains on the reign of Parākramabāhu II. It gives useful details such as the date of the accession of Parākramabāhu in the year 1779 of the Buddhist Era.[2] This date agrees with that given in other sources, notably the Devundara inscription of Parākramabāhu II. We are told that he fought many a war before he unified the three kingdoms. The interesting information on this ruler contained in this work, but not known from other sources, is that he became afflicted with an ailment which interfered with his speech in his twenty-second year. All medical and other remedies proved of no avail. The important officials of the court discussed the matter and decided to appeal to the grace of god Utpalavaṇṇa. Parākramabāhu's minister Devapatirāja of Dunuketuvaṃsa was made to proceed to Devinuvara and perform the Äsaḷa festival. This was done and various endowments were made to the

---

[1] Laṅkāvē Puskola Pot Nāmāvaliya, Colombo, 1959.

[2] Sinh. Sā. Lipi, 67.

shrine of Utpalavaṇṇa. The minister tidied himself and observed aṭa sil and invoked the god. The god appeared at midnight in a dream, in the guise of a brāhmaṇa and made it known to him that the king's ailment was incurable. On hearing the news the king consoled himself that it was a result of a misdeed in a previous birth.

According to this work Parākramabāhu's death took place in his thirty-third year but we have already referred to a statement in the Pūjāvaliya that he was alive in his thirty-fifth year. The Cūlavaṃsa gives this ruler a reign of thirty-five years.[1] It is therefore difficult to accept the tradition of this document that Parākramabāhu's death took place in his thirty-third regnal year.

After its account of Parākramabāhu II the work goes on to deal with the edifices built at Alutnuvara Dēvālaya by Bhuvanekabāhu I. Parākramabāhu's immediate successor, Vijayabāhu IV, is not mentioned. Then it gives an account of the grants of land and other endowments to the Dēvālaya by successive Sinhalese kings, making brief allusions at times to political events in their reigns.

In this part of the document which has not been published so far in addition to Bhuvanekabāhu referred to above, Parākramabāhu VI of Kōṭṭe, Māyādunne and Rājasiṃha I of Sītāvaka are mentioned together with their dates of accession in the Śaka era. The last king mentioned

---

[1] Pjv., 140; Cv., LXXXIX, 71.

in it is Vimaladharmasūriya I of Senkaḍagalapura (Kandy) who is stated to have ascended the throne in Śaka 1518 (1596 A.D.). It therefore appears that, unless successive endowments were added to from time to time, it would have been composed not earlier than the end of the sixteenth century. But there is some reason to believe that additions were made later, for, the narrative in the latter part often looks scrappy. It appears to us that, irrespective of the time in which this work took its present form, the information on Parākramabāhu II is based on old traditions dating back probably to the reign of this ruler. It is difficult to understand how the tradition concerning the ailment of Parākramabāhu II could have arisen without some foundation. It will be shown in this study that this tradition is in keeping with Parākramabāhu's comparative inactivity in the last part of his reign when his sons and nephew Vīrabāhu played a prominent part in the administration of his kingdom.

The information on the Alutnuvara Dēvālaya and the Devinuvara shrine given in this work would be useful in tracing the history of these important shrines.

Apart from the works so far considered, there are other texts which we do not propose to discuss here as they have been discussed by previous writers. The Nikāya Saṃgrahaya which purports to give a history of Buddhism from the earliest times up to the time of the author was written by Jayabāhu in the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu V of Gampola.[1] The

[1] Ed. D.P.R.Samaranāyaka, Colombo, 1960; See Sirima Wickramasinghe, op.cit., chapter on Sources.

last 'purification' of the Saṃgha mentioned in this text is dated in the year 1941 of the Buddhist Era (1398 A.D.). The author has taken pains to show the hardships which befell the Sāsana over which it triumphed in the end. It contains information on the reform of the Saṃgha in the reign of Parākramabāhu II. Mention is also made of the hardships which the Saṃgha underwent in the times of Māgha. This work is useful not only for the times of Parākramabāhu II but also for any study connected with the historyof Buddhism in Ceylon up to the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu V.

The Saddharma Ratnākaraya was written by Vimalakīrtti Thera, a pupil of Dharmakīrtti II, in the seventeenth year of the reign of Parākramabāhu VI (1412-67).[1] It is a large volume of thirty-six chapters devoted to the exposition of various points of the Dhamma. The section which deals with the history of the Sāsana is mainly based on the Nikāya Saṃgrahaya. The nature of this text and an alaysis of its contents chapter by chapter is given by Godakumbura in his Sinhalese Literature.[2] The information in the Saddharma Ratnākaraya would be useful for an understanding of the course of events from the death of Parākramabāhu II up to the reign of Parakramabāhu VI. Particularly noteworthy are the data on the powerful minister Alagak-

---

[1] Ed. Dharmakīrti Śrī Suguṇasāra Devānanda Thera, Colombo, 1955.

[2] Sinh. Lit., 94-97.

kōnāra and the Alakesvara family, important for the role they played in the history of this period. Similarly, the colophon gives information on the line of Dharmakīrtti to which the author belonged.

Information of historical value comes sometimes from stray references in the literary works of this period. For example, the Sasadāvata written in the reign of queen Līlāvatī contains information on some aspects of her reign not known from the Pali Chronicle.[1] Attention as been drawn to these passages by Paranavitana.[2] Similarly, the Upāsaka Janālaṅkāra, a Pali text on lay ethics, sheds light on the condition of the country after it had been invaded by the Tamils, probably a reference to the times of Māgha.[3] Its author Bhadanta Ānanda, as stated in the colophon of this work, was one of the many theras who fled from Ceylon to South India in search of protection when the country was sacked by the Tamils. It is stated that he wrote the Upāsaka Janālaṅkāra while residing in a vihāra in the Pāṇḍya country, constructed by a ruler described as a vaññosāmanta, who appears to have been a feudatory.

Among the later Sinhalese Chronicles mention may be made of the Rājaratnākaraya, written by the mahāthera of Valgampāya who was the head of the Abhayarāja Parivena during the reign of Vikramabāhu of Kandy, who

---

[1] Ed. Dhammapāla Thera, Colombo, 1934, verses 11-12.

[2] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXI, No. 82 (1929), 384-87.

[3] Ed. Dhammakkhanda Thera, revised edition, Väligama, 1914.

ascended the throne in 1541.[1] This work gives a brief account of the kings of Ceylon from the earliest times, devoting greater attention to important rulers like Parākramabāhu I. It often merely mentions the names of kings. The account of Vikramabāhu is more detailed. This author refers to the main events of the reign of Parakramabāhu II, but adds little that is new.

The Sinhalese Chronicle Rājāvaliya has been discussed by previous writers, more recently by Godakumbura, who gives an excellent account of the nature of the text drawing attention to its various recensions.[2] Rājāvaliya attempts to give a history of the island from the earliest times. In the form of the text as we have it now, its account ends with the reign of Vimaladharmasūriya II. These works have not proved to be of primary importance to our study and, where they have been consulted, we have tried to exercise the necessary caution.

Works like the Kurunägala Vistaraya which are of a later date contain useful topographical information together with local traditions.[3] They add little to our understanding of the developments in this period.

---

[1] Ed. Simon de Silva, Colombo, 1907.

[2] Sirima Wickramasinghe, op.cit.; see chapter on Sources; 'Historical writing of the Sinhalese', C.E.Godakumbura in Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon, 72-86.

[3] British Museum Library, Manuscript No. Or. 6607 (12); F.H.Modder, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XIII, No. 44 (1893), 35-57.

Mention may be made of a Pali Chronicle from Siam, the Jinakālamālī written by Ratanapaññā Mahāthera of Rattavana Vihāra. It is stated to have been completed in the year 2060 of the Buddhist Era. The Jinakālamālī first appeared in an edition in Siamese characters; subsequently A. P. Buddhadatta Thera brought out an edition in Sinhalese script with a Sinhalese translation.[1] More recently, Buddhadatta Thera edited this text for the Pali Text Society.[2] The relevance of this work to our study lies in its account of a Sīhalapaṭimā (Siṃhala image), which is stated to have been secured for Rocarāja of Sukhothai by king Siridhamma of Siridhammanagara. According to some scholars this episode has a bearing on Ceylon's relations with the kingdom of Tāmbraliṅga in the Malay Peninsula in the time of Parākramabāhu II. This account will be examined in our discussion of Ceylon's relations with the Malay Peninsula. Whatever may be its importance in so far as its account of this paṭimā is concerned, this Chronicle will be very useful in a study of Ceylon's relations with Thailand in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as it contains information on this subject not known from Ceylonese sources.

Apart from the literary sources so far considered, a considerable amount of archaeological material has been utilized in this study,

---

[1] Colombo, 1956.

[2] London, 1962.

particularly inscriptions both from Ceylon and outside. In studies on Ceylon history, in spite of the continuous records of the island's history in the Pali Chronicles, archaeological data, especially inscriptions, have proved very useful. Very often they confirm the Chronicle account and, at other times, they have helped to supplement and modify the picture of events given in the Chronicles.[1] Thus the importance of epigraphic sources for our study cannot be underestimated.

For the period between the death of Parākramabāhu I and the reign of Vijayabāhu III we have a considerable body of archaeological evidence in the form of monuments in Rājaraṭṭha, some of which are in a good state of preservation. We are concerned here in particular with the inscriptions of this period. Though these inscriptions are not numerous, some contain information on political events. Quite a number of inscriptions belong to kings of the Kaliṅga line. In many of them these rulers have recounted the circumstances of their arrival in Ceylon together with details of their ancestry. They also sometimes refer to contemporary political events which are of primary interest to us. For example, inscriptions dating from the reigns of Vijayabāhu II and Sāhassamalla - two princes who came over to Ceylon from Kaliṅga - contain information not only of their ancestry, but they give us an insight into the political conflicts of the period.[2]

---

[1] See L. S. Perera in U.C.H.C., I, pt. I, 66-72.

[2] For example: 'Polonnaruva Slab Inscription of Sāhasa-Malla', Ep. Zeyl.

(cont.)

However, the largest number of inscriptions for any single ruler in any period of Ceylon history belongs to the reign of Nissaṅka Malla.[1] These inscriptions throw light on many aspects of his reign not known from the Pali Chronicle. They also confirm to a great extent the brief account of his reign given in the Cūlavaṃsa. His visit to Samantakūṭa, the construction of a Tooth Relic Temple and the embellishment of the Jambukola Vihāra (Dambulla Vihāra) mentioned in the Cūlavaṃsa are confirmed by his inscriptions.[2] His inscriptions refer to an invasion of South India in eulogistic language, but historians have been reluctant to take these claims too seriously. Owing to obvious exaggerations these records are sometimes not given due consideration, but weaned of their extravagance they could become useful sources of history. His inscriptions create the impression that Nissaṅka Malla was a ruler who devoted himself energetically to keep his kingdom intact and to promote Buddhism.

Similarly, useful information bearing on political events are found in the inscriptions of queen Līlāvatī and queen Kalyāṇavatī.[3] Unfortunately so far no inscriptions of the reign of Māgha have come

---

(cont.) II, No. 36 (1923), 219-29; 'Polonnaruva: Slab Inscription of Vijayabāhu II', No. 30, 179-84; Bōpiṭiya 'Slab Inscription of Kalyāṇavatī', No. 32, 190-92.

[1] Ep. Zeyl., II, Nos. 13-29, 84-178; III, No. 11, 149-52; No. 35, 325-31.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 18-26, See below, 120-32.

[3] Ep. Zeyl. I, No. 14, 176-82; II. No. 33, 192-94, No. 32, 190-92; IV, No. 33, 253-60.

to light. As will be shown in our examination of the reign of this ruler he appears to have been a strange figure in some respects. Had we had the advantage of epigraphy, it would have been possible to bring in greater precision to our understanding of the reign of Māgha.

For the reigns of Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II we have very few epigraphic records which, in this respect, is in contrast to the reign of Parākramabāhu I. The limited information contained in a few inscriptions datable in this period is of little assistance for an understanding of the political history on which our emphasis falls in this study. The available inscriptions, however limited their contents may be, will be examined in chapter VI.

One redeeming feature, however, is that a number of inscriptions from South India datable in this period throw light on an aspect of Parākramabāhu's reign on which hardly anything is known from the Ceylon sources. We refer to the inscriptions of the reigns of Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya and Jaṭāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya, which mention invasions of Ceylon in the reign of Parakramabāhu II.[1] The inscriptions of the latter, particularly the prasasti from Kuḍumiyāmālai, referred to earlier, give details of Vīra Pāṇḍya's expedition to Ceylon and the circumstances in which it was undertaken.[2] These records will be ex-

---

[1] See Chapter V.

[2] T.B.G., LXXVII, 251-68.

amined in detail in chapter V of this study. Despite their value, they raise difficult problems. For, the most important of these records, the Kuḍumiyāmalai Prasasti for example, has a difficult text damaged in places which are vital to an understanding of the events mentioned in it. Other problems connected with these records will be discussed in Chapter V.

Similarly, the well known Jaiyā inscription of Candrabhānu from the Malay Peninsula is important for an understanding of the Jāvaka invasions of Ceylon in the reign of Parākramabāhu II.[1] Thus, if the epigraphic records dated in this period are not numerous, at least some of them are of very great importance as they throw light on significant events.

Such then is the nature of the sources utilized in this study. It was considered necessary to stress the limitations set by our sources in several stages of this thesis. However, it would be clear from this survey that, though epigraphic records are not available in sufficient numbers with adequate details, we have a large variety of literary sources apart from the Cūlavaṃsa. Here again it is significant that quite a few of them, such as the Pūjāvaliya and the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa are contemporary works. Though their accounts sometimes lack precision and at times tend to exaggerate, nevertheless they have been of great value to our study. In these

---

[1] G. Coedès, Recuil des Inscriptions du Siam, II, 25-27.

circumstances we have had to depend on literary sources to a greater extent, even where epigraphic testimony would have been most valuable, such as in the case of Māgha. This, however, is a limitation which cannot be remedied. Even so, the variety of literary sources, some of which, as stated earlier, date back to the reign of Parākramabāhu II, makes up for this limitation partially by supplementing the Cūlavaṃsa account. In spite of the value of these sources it must be stressed here that they, too, often lack precision anddetail. In such cases, therefore, we were compelled to restrain ourselves by not pressing our conclusions beyond the point of safety even where one might have desired greater precision. Such difficulties are perhaps not confined to Ceylon history alone where medieval historical studies are concerned.

Chapter II

The Disintegration of the Polonnaruva Kingdom.

The reign of Parākramabāhu I (1153-1186 A.D.), which has been the subject of unreserved eulogy in the Chronicles of Ceylon, is still considered a glorious chapter in the history of the island. The people of Ceylon regard Parākramabāhu I as one of their greatest national heroes. His achievements in the political, economic and religious spheres are described in the Cūlavaṃsa in glowing terms. It has to be borne in mind that this Chronicle, in the glorification of its hero Parākramabāhu, resorts to exaggeration and sometimes omits facts which would detract from his greatness. As Geiger has pointed out,[1] these could easily be detected, and need not therefore present insuperable difficulties in gaining a fair idea of his achievements. Besides, epigraphic and archaeological evidence can throw considerable light on many aspects of his reign. The account of the Chronicle is on many points confirmed by epigraphic records and archaeological monuments dated in his reign.[2] It appears from an examination of these sources that his rule, which lasted a little over three decades, was one of general prosperity, reflected in the construction of large-scale irrigation works, numerous mona-

---

[1] IHQ. VI. 228.

[2] CHJ. IV, 175-81.

steries and other religious edifices, remarkable both for their size and number. The reign of Parākramabāhu was the subject of a detailed study completed by Sirima Wickramasinghe a few years ago.[1] It would, however, be useful to have an outline of Parākramabāhu's reign before we examine the developments that followed his death.

He effected the unification of Ceylon, which had remained divided into petty principalities torn by rivalry and internal dissension for nearly four decades after the death of Vijayabāhu (1055-1110). The chapters of the Cūlavaṃsa dealing with his early life contain matter that was apparently woven in to demonstrate the prowess and future greatness of the prince.[2] The dreams of his father, which augured the birth of Parākramabāhu and the prophecies of his future greatness, are literary embellishments also used elsewhere in the Chronicle in dealing with other heroes.[3] He left Mahānāgakula where he lived with his mother and arrived at Saṅkhanāyakatthalī (Hatnāgoḍa) in Dakkhiṇadesa, where its ruler Kittisirimagha, who was his uncle, welcomed him and arranged for his education.[4] He was, however, too restless to continue to stay

---

[1] Ph. D. Thesis (unpublished), University of London, 1958.

[2] Cv. Tr., I, Introduction, iv-xiv.

[3] Cv., LXII, 12-26; 27-29; Mv., XXII, 34 ff.

[4] Cv., LXIII, 43-45; J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VI, 102,123; U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 443; Cv., LXIV, 1-5.

with his uncle and left in secret for Rājaraṭṭha - the kingdom of his brother-in-law (sūru-baḍu) Gajabāhu II. In the course of this flight he put to death one of the most loyal and trusted generals (senāpati) of Kittisirimegha whose hospitality he had enjoyed. Curiously enough, this act of ingratitude is the subject of a whole chapter in the Culavaṃsa (LXV: The Killing of the Senāpati), the intention of which is to foreshadow the prowess of the prince. In Rajaraṭṭha he travelled about and gained an idea of its military strength, food supplies and other data which he considered useful for his future plans.[1]

On the death of his uncle Kittisirimegha, who had no son to succeed him, Parākramabāhu became the lord (mahādipāda) of the principality of Dakkhiṇadesa. It is interesting to note that, while the Cūlavaṃsa makes it very clear that Parākramabāhu was the son of Mānābharaṇa and queen Ratnavalī, Sinhalese Chronicles state that he was a son of Kittisirimegha.[2] Besides, the Pali Chronicle also states that Kittisirimegha had no son.[3] At first sight it may appear that there is no unanimity in these literary works on the paternity of a ruler whose achievements are treated with considerable de-

---

[1] Cv., LXVI.

[2] Cv., LXII, 40-53; Pjv., 105; Dal. Pjv., 59; Rjv., 42.

[3] Cv., LXIII, 43-45.

tail even in the lesser chronicles. For example the Pūjāvaliya, which does not mention Mānābharaṇa at all, refers to Parākramabāhu as a son of Kittisirimegha. This confusion may have arisen due to on account of the fact that Parākramabāhu was brought up by Kittisirimegha after the death of Mānābharaṇa. In other words, Kittisirimegha played the role of a father to the young prince during this period. This is not without precedent. The Mahāvaṃsa states that Vaṭṭagāmaṇī Abhaya (103 and 89-77 B.C.) came to be called pitarāja (father-king) because he adopted his brother's son Mahācūli Mahātissa.[1] That this was indeed the case with Parākramabāhu too is clear from the fact that the Cūlavaṃsa in its narrative from the death of Mānābharaṇa also refers to Kittisirimegha and Parākramabāhu as father and son respectively.[2] There is no valid reason to doubt the authenticity of the Cūlavaṃsa version as to the paternity of Parākramabāhu. Some later writers, however, regarded Kittisirimegha as his father. The Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya, in which we find a number of confused traditions, definitely states that Parākramabāhu was born to queen Ratnāvalī through Kīrtti Śrī Megha. In spite of this contradictory statement in the Daḷada Pūjāvaliya this confusion is more apparent than real.

---

[1] Mv., XXXIII, 35-36. For Paranavitana's interpretation of this epithet see God of Adam's Peak, 61-67.

[2] Cv., LXIII, 53; LXIV, 5, 13; LXVII, 55; Geiger, Cv.Tr., I, 242, note 1.

Having assumed the overlordship of Dakkhiṇadesa, the prince started to make preparations for his future campaigns against Rājaraṭṭha and Rōhaṇa in order to bring the whole of Ceylon under his rule. Knowing that Dakkhiṇadesa could be the base of operations, he took steps to improve its administrative machinery and military resources. These activities are described in considerable detail in the chapters entitled 'The Improvement of his own Kingdom' (LXVIII) and 'The Collection of Military Forces and Money (LXIX). The main irrigation works were constructed by harnessing the waters of the Jajjarā-nadī (Dädüru Oya).[1] Marshland in the Paṃcayōjana District (Pasdun Kōralē) was drained and rendered cultivable.[2] A large number of officials with specialised functions was appointed to the different departments such as the sēnāpati (commander-in-chief of the army (and Military Services), gaṇakāmacca (accountant) and bhaṇḍāgārādhikāri (chief of the treasury). It is possible that the account in the Cūlavaṃsa was based upon knowledge of the administrative machinery in the royal capitals of Anurādhapura and Polonnaruva. On the other hand, his acquaintance with Indian texts on polity such as the Arthaśāstra can be detected in the narrative of the Cūlavaṃsa.[3] and

---

[1] Cv., LXVIII, 16 ff.

[2] Cv., LVIII, 51-55.

[3] Cv., LXIV, 45-46; LXVI, 129 ff; LXIV, 1-5.

must have influenced his description of the administrative machinery which Parākramabāhu set up in Dakkhiṇadesa, which may have served as a basis for the more elaborate administrative system which he enforced from Polonnaruva. He also provided for the training of military personnel and strengthened and equipped the different branches of the army.[1] All these measures contributed to making Dakkhiṇadesa a powerful principality from which Parākramabāhu could direct future operations in his bid to become the paramount ruler of the island. He set up his capital at Parākramapura in the centre of his kingdom.[2]

As a first step in his campaigns the area adjoining Malayadesa was conquered. We do not propose to follow the strategy and topographical aspects of these campaigns here.[3] Malayadesa presents a difficult terrain covered by thick jungle and inaccessible hills with no more than foot-paths as lines of communication. The Cūlavaṃsa states that the planning of battles and the movement of troops was based on the lines prescribed in the ancient texts on polity such as the Arthaśāstra.[4] It is clear from the narrative of the Chronicle

---

[1] Cv., LXIX, 5 ff.

[2] A.S.C.A.R., 1947, 10[illegible] ff; see 'Paṇḍuvasnuvara', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VI, 104.

[3] H.W. Codrington, J.R.A.S.Cey. Br., XXIX, 62-74, XXX, 70-91.

[4] Cv., LXX, 56.

that attempts were made to win over Gajabāhu's generals by presents and promise of honours. The conquest of Malayadesa was undertaken apparently to prevent the defeated troops of Gajabāhu from taking refuge in its hills and forests. The annexation of Malayâdesa was completed by war and intrigue without much loss of time, although the Chronicle does not state how long the campaign lasted.

The conquest of Rājaraṭṭha - the kingdom of Gajabāhu - was his next major operation. The excuse given in the Chronicle that Parākramabāhu took offence because 'the ruler Gajabāhu had fetched nobles of heretical faith from abroad and had thus filled Rājaraṭṭha with the briers (of heresy)' is perhaps a pretext to justify his aggression into the latter's territory.[1] In the course of the war Parākramabāhu's forces scored early victories and Gajabāhu was virtually reduced to the position of a prisoner in Polonnaruva.[2] Gajabāhu's ministers and high officials appealed to the ruler of Rōhaṇa - Mānabharaṇa - for assistance. In spite of the previous understanding he had with Parākramabāhu for common action Mānābharaṇa availed himself of this opportunity and sent forces to Rājaraṭṭha to relieve the hard-pressed Gajabāhu.[3] Gajabāhu had to pay the price of the assistance he received.

---

[1] Cv., LXX, 53-55.

[2] Cv., LXX, 239-50.

[3] Cv., LXX, 254-255.

Mānābharaṇa imprisoned Gajabāhu and set himself up as the ruler of Rājarattha.[1] The Tooth Relic, the Alms Bowl and other valuable treasures were seized and taken to Rohaṇa.[2] Gajabāhu in his miserable plight approached Parākramabāhu for assistance, which the latter readily granted, for it was clear to Parākramabāhu that Mānābharaṇa was the greater threat to his ambition. Parākramabāhu's troops successfully entered Polonnaruva and released Gajabāhu, although this did not lead to an immediate cessation of the conflict. Intermittent fighting went on, but before long a peace settlement was arrived at. We learn from the Cūḷavaṃsa that the Saṃgha was instrumental in bringing Parākramabāhu to terms with Gajabāhu.[3] The request made by the Saṃgha to Parākramabāhu was:

> 'Now the Ruler of Men (Gajabāhu) has neither a son nor brothers, but he himself being so old, is near death. Thy pledged word that the gaining of the royal dominion has as object only the furtherance of the laity and the Order will thus shortly be fulfilled. Therefore shalt thou give up the state and return to thine own province hearkening to the word of the bhikkhu congregation'.[4]

The peace settlement thus arrived at, the Chronicle goes on, was

---

[1] Cv., LXX, 63-64.

[2] Cv., LXX, 265-266.

[3] Cv., LXX, 327 ff.

[4] Cv., LXX, 333-335.

engraved on a stone tablet with the words: 'I have made over Rājarattha to Parākkama'.[1] This record has not come to light so far but a copy of it has been discovered at Samgamu Vihāra, situated two miles to the north-east of Gōkarälla in the Hätahaya Kōralē of the Kurunägala District.[2] Although this inscription confirms the event recorded in the Chronicle there are a few discrepancies in the two records. The Cūlavamsa would have us believe that Parākramabāhu returned the kingdom of Rājarattha to Gajabāhu out of sheer mercy. But according to the terms of the treaty (sandhāna), as recorded in the inscription, the two opponents seem to have met as equals. Precedence of rank is offered to Gajabāhu. It is reciprocally agreed that the enemy of one of their kingdoms was also the enemy of the other, which in effect meant mutual assistance in the event of their kingdoms being attacked. They also agreed not to make war against one another. In the event of the death of either of them, his kingdom should belong to the survivor. Thus the terms of the treaty are reciprocal and the Chronicle version that Gajabāhu humbled himself before Parākramabāhu and that the latter entered into the treaty as an act of mercy has been modified. The picture that emerges from the Cūlavamsa is touched up by the chroni-

---

[1] Cv., LXXI, 3-4.

[2] Ep. Zeyl., IV, 1 ff.

cler to make the transaction appear more favourable to its hero. On the other hand, as Paranavitana has pointed out, in reality it was Parākramabāhu who gained more from this treaty, for Gajabāhu was old, and the former would have had the opportunity of succeeding to the throne of Rājaraṭṭha before long.[1] Moreover, by this agreement Parākramabāhu's claim to the throne of Rājaraṭṭha was strengthened, which was a clear advantage over Mānābharaṇa, who could also put forward claims to the throne of that kingdom. Hence Parākramabāhu had undoubtedly all to gain and nothing to lose by this treaty. Though an analysis of the terms of the settlement would lead to this impression, yet the partiality of the chronicler is unmistakable.

In spite of this treaty, according to which Parākramabāhu was entitled to the throne of Rājaraṭṭha, events took a different turn at the death of Gajabāhu. Gajabāhu's ministers invited Mānābharaṇa to cross over to Rājaraṭṭha with his troops.[2] Parākramabāhu, however, lost no time in having the strategic points on the Mahavăli Gaṅga from Sarōgāmatittha to Gokaṇṇa, where Mānābharaṇa's forces could cross the river, heavily guarded. Mānābharaṇa's forces crossed over to Rājaraṭṭha at an unguarded point on the riverine frontier and Parākramabāhu's forces were forced to retreat as far as Parākramapūra and Kalyāṇi in Dakkhiṇ-

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., IV, No. 1, 4-8.

[2] Cv., LXXI, 7-10.

adesa.[1] Before long Parākramabāhu strengthened his forces and took the offensive and, as a line of strategy, an attempt was made to divide the forces of Mānābharaṇa by attacking them in several directions. After bitter fighting Mānābharaṇa was forced to abandon his campaign. He fled to Rohaṇa leaving behind prince Siri Vallabha (his son) and much valuable treasure. He was not pursued into his kingdom. Mānābharaṇa died shortly afterwards, appealing to the princes of his family from his death-bed that they should obey the orders and follow the lead of Parākramabāhu.[2] It is difficultto understand why Mānābharaṇa, after fighting against Parākramabāhu for many years, should have expressed such admiration for his adversary in his last days. It seems that the statement is no more than a pious wish of the chronicler.

Parākramabāhu in this manner achieved his ambition and became the paramount sovereign over the whole of Ceylon. This victory was completed only after subjugating the recalcitrant queen Sugalā, mother of Mānābharaṇa, who raised a revolt in Rohaṇa. The fact that she possessed the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl must have been the main reason for her success in gathering a sufficiently large following. The determined resistance which Mānābharaṇa offered also shows that the people of Rohaṇa followed his leadership faithfully and were not pre-

---

[1] Cv., LXXII, 148-51.

[2] Cv., LXXII, 301-310.

pared to succumb to Parākramabāhu's aggression easily. At this stage Parākramabāhu had to quell a revolt raised by the Siṃhaḷa and Keraḷa soldiers along with the Vēḷakkāra mercenaries, which in some measure was a setback to his efforts in subjugating Rohaṇa. The situation did not get out of control, queen Sugalā was captured and brought to Poḷonnaruva and the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl were secured. One of the main objectives of this campaign must have been to secure these relics, the possession of which added strength to his tenure of the throne. Without these relics his position on the throne would have been insecure in the eyes of the Buddhist population.

Having unified the country Parākramabāhu gave the island three decades of peace and prosperity. Except for brief moments when dissentient elements rose in revolt the country enjoyed a period of comparative peace, which is sometimes referred to as the 'Augustan Age' of Ceylonese history.[1] His reign stands out in unique relief when one considers the disorder and instability which had characterised the political life of the country since the death of Vijayabāhu I. He devoted his attention to the restoration of the Sāsana, which had been neglected for long and had consequently suffered for want of royal

---

[1] G. P. Malalasekara, Pali Lit.Cey., 175 ff.

patronage. In the field of irrigation and agriculture his undertakings were in some respects unparallelled.

Polonnaruva was restored and converted into a beautiful city, dotted with numerous religious edifices, secular buildings and parks. The Cūlavaṃsa contains a vivid description of these building activities in the chapters entitled 'Account of the Rebuilding of Pulatthinagara' (LXXIII), 'The Laying out of Gardens and the Like (LXXIX), 'The Building of Vihāras' (LXXVIII). Archaeological exploration has brought to light the ruins of some of these buildings and it appears that, with the exception of the buildings erected by Nissaṅka Malla, Polonnaruva was largely the creation of Parākramabāhu.[1] The attempt he made to purify the Sāsana may be mentioned as one of the most important steps taken to restore Buddhism. He effected the unification of the three fraternities which, according to the Cūlavaṃsa, had remained divided since the days of Vaṭṭagāmaṇī Abhaya.[2] According to the Nikāya Saṃgrahaya these three fraternities were the Dharmaruci, Sāgalika and the Vaitulyavādī sects.[3] The Cūlavaṃsa in describing the condition of the Saṃgha refers to the 'numerous unscrupulous bhikkhus whose whole task is filling their bellies'.[4] Their disharmony

---

[1] See Paranavitana, C.H.J., IV, 69-90.

[2] Cv., LXXIII, 17-19.

[3] Nks., 87.

[4] Cv., LXXIII, 5.

was so great that they 'did not wish to have ceremonies in common nor even to see one another'.[1] The task of organizing and effecting the 'purification' of the Saṃgha was entrusted to the learned mahāthera Mahākassapa, who was to have the assistance of other leading theras of the time such as Moggallāna and Sāriputta, who are known to us also from their literary works.[2] The Galvihāra Rock Inscription of Parākramabāhu, which records the disciplinary rules for the guidance of monks, issued by the council set up for this purpose, gives a valuable account of this event.[3] This document portrays the condition of the Saṃgha during the period and is of great value for the understanding of religious conditions in the period that followed. That his efforts at restoring and uplifting the condition of the Saṃgha yielded only temporary results is clear from the numerous similar 'purifications' effected by subsequent rulers.[4]

Irrigation and agriculture were fields to which he paid particular attention, even before becoming the supreme lord of the island (dīpa-cakravarti), in his capacity as the mahādipāda of Dakkhiṇadesa.[5] Nicholas has pointed out that according to the Cūḷavaṃsa

---

[1] Cv., LXXVIII, 4.

[2] Malalasekara, Pali Lit.Cey., 196 ff.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 41, p.256 ff.

[4] C.H.J., IV, 121, for example, Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II.

[5] Cv., LXVIII.

he constructed or restored as many as 165 anicuts, 3910 canals, 163 major tanks, 2376 minor tanks, 341 stone sluices and repaired 1753 breaches.[1] Some of these may be merely restoration work, for the Chronicle uses the words kāresi and kārāpesi (built or caused to be built) in the sense of restoration, too.[2] From these figures, even if their accuracy is open to doubt, Parākramabāhu's claim to be the greatest tank-builder of Ceylon receives confirmation. His most celebrated irrigation works, Parākrama Samudra, in its restored form has a bund 8½ miles long, with an average height of 40 feet above the ground level. The area of the tank is 5350 acres with an irrigable area of 18,200 acres.[3] Projects of this magnitude, which aimed at the economic development of the country, must have led to the general prosperity without which his bold attempts at conquests in countries across the seas would not have been possible. The maxim which, the Cūlavaṃsa says, emanated from this ruler - that not a drop of rain water should be allowed to reach the ocean without having served man, is to this day remembered by the people of Ceylon.[4]

---

[1] Cv., LXXIX, 23-84; Nicholas, C.H.J., IV, 60.

[2] Cf., Mv., XXXIII, 6 and XXXVI, 25.

[3] C.W.Nicholas, C.H.J., IV, 63.

[4] Cv., LXVIII, 11.

Parākramabāhu having strengthened his sovereignty over the whole of Ceylon does not seem to have been content with a power confined to the island. Surprisingly, he seems to have come into conflict with the king of Rāmañña - a country with which Ceylon had maintained friendly relations over a long period, as is categorically stated in the Chronicle.[1] The precise reason which gave rise to this breach of friendship is not clear but, if the Cūlavamsa is to be trusted, it seems to have arisen out of a conflict of interests in the elephant trade, in which both countries were concerned.[2] Subsequently it is also stated that a princess whom Parākramabāhu sent to the king of Kamboja was seized by the king of Rāmañña.[3] In retaliation, Parākramabāhu dispatched forces, a section of which landed at a port called Kusumī (Bassein), destroyed the country of the Rāmañña king and slew the king himself.[4] Burmese Chronicles make no mention of this event. The Kalyāni Inscriptions of king Dhammaceti of Pegu dated 1476 A.D. refer to the religious relations between Burma and Ceylon during this period but add nothing to elucidate our problem. But, that Parākramabāhu's generals at least

---

[1] Cv., LXXVI, 11-13.

[2] Cv., LXXVI, 15 ff.

[3] Cv., LXXVI, 35.

[4] Cv., LXXVI, 59-68.

raided the coasts of Burma, is confirmed by the Devanagala Inscription of Parākramabāhu, which records a grant of land to Kitnuvaragal (Kittinagaragiri) in recognition of his services in the campaign against Aramaṇa (Rāmañña), who according to the Cūlavamsa was the general who figured prominently in this war.[1] There is no evidence at present to believe that it was anything more than a raid of the coasts of Burma to chastise the king, and there is still less evidence to hold that Parākramabāhu derived any economic or political rewards from this adventure.

Parākramabāhu's intervention in the Pāṇḍyan war of succession entangled him in the struggle for supremacy in which the Pāṇḍyas and the Coḷas were then involved. From about the ninth century it became the settled policy of the kings of Ceylon to ally themselves with the Pāṇḍyas against the Coḷas.[2] Sena II (853-87) successfully intervened in Pāṇḍyan affairs and placed a prince favourable to him on the throne of that kingdom.[3] From that time onwards the alliance continued, but apparently brought no positive benefit to the Sinhalese kings, for the Pāṇḍyas could hardly maintain their own independance against the rising power of the Coḷas.[4] The Sinhalese kings

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., III, No. 34, 312-24.

[2] C. U.H.C., I, pt. I, 329-330.

[3] C. U.H.C., I, pt. I, 329-30. Sēna II is called 'Madurā-dunu' (conqueror of Madhurā) in his Inscriptions.

[4] The Colas, 120 ff.

did not abandon this tradition of maintaining friendly relations with the Pāṇḍyas and Parākramabāhu also followed it. Vijayabāhu I who expelled the Coḷas from Ceylon gave his sister in marriage to a Pāṇḍyan prince.[1] Parākramabāhu too had a Pāṇḍyan queen.[2] Parākramabāhu's intention must have been to maintain the balance of power in South India by assisting the Pāṇḍyas. Perhaps he also felt that such a step would add lustre to his crown. In the Pāṇḍyan kingdom war broke out between the two Pāṇḍyan princes, Kulaśēkhara, son of Māravarman Śrī Vallabha, and Parākrama Pāṇḍya over the succession to the throne of Madurai.[3] Which of the two princes was the legitimate heir to the throne cannot be determined in the present state of our knowledge. Parākrama appealed to Parākramabāhu for military assistance when Kulaśēkhara besieged his capital.[4] Parākramabāhu ordered his general Laṃkāpura to lead his forces to Madurai and reinstate Parākrama on the throne of Madurai. But before Laṃkāpura could set out from Ceylon, Kulaśēkhara had murdered Parākrama and had captured Madurai.[5] Laṃkāpura continued his ex-

---

[1] Cv., LIX, 41.

[2] See below, 124.

[3] The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, 128 ff.

[4] Cv., LXXVI, 76-79.

[5] Cv., LXXVI, 86.

pedition on the orders of Parākramabāhu to oust Kulasēkhara and to place on the throne a scion of the family of Parākrama. Lamkāpura 'embarked his great army on many hundreds of ships' and landed in the Pandu kingdom at the port of Taladilla.[1] The Cūlavamsa would have us believe that the Sinhalese forces scored victories throughout. 'Needless to say the Sinhalese general was victorious in all of them, killing many Tamils.'[2]

Although the Cūlavamsa records no Sinhalese reverses South Indian inscriptions fill the void and helped to modify our picture. The Pali Chronicle does not preserve any chronology in its narrative of these campaigns and even South Indian inscriptions are not decisive in that respect. The Arpākkam Inscription of the fifth year of Rājādhirāja II[3] confirms the Cūlavamsa narrative in that Lamkāpura at first gained victories over Kulasēkhara. It states that Pāndimandala was captured and Kulasēkhara was driven out of Madurai and so far the Chronicle and our inscription are in agreement, but the latter adds the important piece of information that Jayadratha, Lamkāpura and the Ceylon army later suffered defeat. The Pallavarāyanpettai Inscription

---

[1] Cv., LXXVI, 87-93.

[2] Cv., LXXVI, 94 ff.

[3] A.R.E., No. 20 of 1899.

of the eighth year of Rājādhirāja II, while stating that Kulaśēkhara was ousted from Madurai, adds that later Kulaśēkhara was reinstated on the throne of Madurai and that Laṃkāpura Daṇḍanāyaka and others were killed and their heads were nailed on the gates of Madurai.[1] A Tamil inscription of the twelfth year of Rājādhirāja (issued in duplicate, one at North Arcot and the other in Tanjore District) also refers to Parākramabāhu's unwillingness to accept defeat and states that he was building ships at Ceylon ports such as Mātōṭṭam, Vallikāmam, Maṭṭivāl to invade the Coḷa country by way of retaliation.[2] These inscriptions recording grants made to two generals, who scored victories for the Coḷas in these campaigns, claim to have invaded Ceylon, devastated the country and that much loot was taken away. We have, however, no confirmation of this episode from Ceylon sources but it is clear from the silence of the Cūlavaṃsa with regard to the fate that overtook Laṃkāpura in the end, as shown by Geiger,[3] and from the inscriptions cited above, that Parākramabāhu's forces ultimately suffered defeat. The war itself dragged on, and the recipients of assistance from the Sinhalese king seem to have adopted an opportunist attitude by changing loyalties

---

[1] A.R.E., No. 433 of 1924; Ep. Ind., XXI, 184-93.

[2] A.R.E., No. 465 of 1905; Ep. Ind., XXII, 86-92.

[3] Cv.Tr., II, p.100, note 1.

whenever it suited them.[1] What we are concerned with in particular here is the possible repercussions of Parākramabāhu's exploits in South India on the subsequent history of Ceylon. To this we will draw attention in the sequel.

Politically, the unification which Parākramabāhu effected seems to have lasted throughout his reign. The Chronicle, however, does record attempts to challenge his authority rather early in his reign but each of them was successfully suppressed.[2] Parākramabāhu's intervention in South Indian politics, though with limited success, shows that he had a fair claim to be called the Supreme Lord of the island (dīpa-cakravatti).[3] The measures he adopted for the economic development of the country and the construction of numerous monasteries and various other religious edifices would not have been possible but for the effective unification of the country, which paved the way for over three decades of peace.

However, the relative peace and stability which the country enjoyed during the reign of this monarch could not remain after his reign. With the death of Parākramabāhu in 1186 we enter a period of disorder and confusion, which culminated in the invasion and sack

---

[1] C.H.J., IV, 51.

[2] Cv., LXXIV, 22 ff, 40-49; LXXVI, 1-9.

[3] Nks., 85.

of Rājarattha by Kaliṅga Māgha about the year 1215.[1] Factionalism and rivalry at the court, deposition or murder of the rulers by powerful generals who were a power behind the throne, were characteristic features of the political climate of this period. Evidence of peaceful termination of the reigns of kings and normal succession to the throne is almost absent. In fact the opposite appears to have been the rule.

The reconstruction of the history of this period is beset with numerous difficulties, and the picture that emerges from an examination of the data in the Chronicles and the epigraphs would be far from complete or coherent. Indeed, the detailed narrative in the Cūlavaṃsa, which runs through the reign of Parākramabāhu, weakens into a sketchy and colourless record in chapter LXXX (The Sixteen Kings). The brevity of the reigns of kings and the frequent 'palace revolutions' alone cannot explain this position, for the reign of Nissaṅka Malla which lasted nine years, certainly remarkable for that period, receives a notice of nine verses only.[2] If his epigraphic records are to be trusted, his reign was one of incessant activity and the Chronicler had ample scope for making more than this brief notice. This change in the tone and content of the Cūlavaṃsa at this point was discussed in the previous chapter.

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 54-79.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 18-26.

Parākramabāhu was succeeded by Vijayabāhu II who, according to the Chronicle, was the sister's son (bhāgineyyo; Sinh. bäṇa) of the former.[1] The Polonnaruva Inscription of Vijayabāhu confirms and supplements the Cūlavaṃsa account of this ruler's reign of one year.[2] The statement that Vijayabāhu was the sister's son of Parākramabāhu has given rise to considerable speculation, which is even more confounded by the addition that Vijayabāhu was called to Ceylon by Parākramabāhu from Siṃhapura in Kaliṅga and was appointed to succeed the latter on the throne of Ceylon.[3] It also adds that he was trained in the science of arms (sastra sāstrayehi nipuṇa karavā) and was invested with the title of himiyā before his accession to the throne.[4] The Cūlavaṃsa mentions three sisters of Parākramabāhu. One of them, princess Bhaddavatī, was married to Gajabāhu II and the other two were the spouses of Mānābharaṇa, the ruler of Rohaṇa.[5] Wickramasinghe thinks that the sister in question was 'no other than Bhaddavatī, the spouse of Gajabāhu II'.[6] But this assumption would

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 1.

[2] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 30, pp. 179-84.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 30, p.183, lines 15-24.

[4] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 30, p. 183, line 20.

[5] Cv., LXVI, 147-50; LXIII, 6-17; LXIV, 24.

[6] Ep. Zeyl. II, 180.

dismiss too summarily the statement in the Cūlavaṃsa that Gajabāhu had 'neither a son nor brothers'.[1] That Vijayabāhu could have been a son of either of the two sisters married to Mānābharaṇa has been ruled out, for the latter was opposed to the ascendency of the Kaliṅga line. The two sons of this marriage, Siri-Vallabha and Kittisirimegha, were later taken captive and were removed to the court of Parākramabāhu.[2] We hear no more of them or the fate that overtook them. It is not, however, altogether impossible, although Wickramasinghe would take objection to it, that a son of Mānābharaṇa born of one of these two princesses was selected for succession to the throne, as he does not appear to have had a son of his own. Mānābharaṇa, from his death-bed, appealed to the princes of his family: 'Go though, without ruining thyself as I (have ruined) myself, to the sovereign Parakkama, do that which he orders thee, and live devoted to him as he shall direct thee'.[3] If he actually made such an appeal in his last days, was it an understanding arrived at by the two cousins in their final settlement of conflicts after many years of fighting that a son of Mānābharaṇa should succeed to the throne on the death of Parākramabāhu? The latter would not have taken objection

---

[1] Cv., LXX, 333.

[2] Cv., LXXII, 291; LXIV, 24; LXXII, 303.

[3] Cv., LXXII, 307-308.

to this proposition for he does not appear to have had a son of his own. If such was the case, and if the purpose of this arrangement was to pacify the rebellious province of Rohaṇa, it seems to have failed, for queen Sugalā, Mānābharaṇa's mother, raised the banner of revolt some years later. The suggestion offered above has some weaknesses. Firstly, the inscription of Vijayabāhu referred to above states that Vijayabāhu came from Kaliṅga, and it is difficult to explain how a son of Mānābharaṇa would have gone to live in that country, when the latter did not look upon the Kaliṅga line with favour. Secondly, if such an arrangement was made by Parākramabāhu for succession to the throne, one may expect it to be mentioned in the Cūlavaṃsa less ambiguously. Thirdly, if a settlement of that nature was reached, queen Sugalā would have had no valid reason to raise a revolt in Rohaṇa which was the principality of Mānābharaṇa. In view of these difficulties, if we are to look for an alternative, we are left with that offered by Geiger, that Parākramabāhu must have had a third sister who was married to a Kaliṅga prince and Vijayabāhu II was an issue of that marriage.[1] This again lacks confirmation, but it would be a less objectionable assumption, placed as we are with insufficient data to arrive at a conclusion on the relationship of Vijayabāhu to Parākramabāhu and

---

[1] Cv. Tr., II, p. 125, n.1.

the parentage of the former.

Vijayabāhu's reign came to a tragic end after one year. It is significant that, though his reign was so brief, the Chronicler deals with his reign in complimentary terms and compared him with a Bodhisatta.[1] He is also credited with having carefully observed the political precepts of Manu while living up to 'the four heart-winning qualities' (catussamgahavatthu).[2] The Chronicle devotes fourteen verses to his brief reign, while even that of Nissaṅka Malla which lasted nine years of enthusiastic activity receives only nine.[3] What precisely caught the imagination of the chronicler in favour of Vijayabāhu we cannot say. That he was a pious ruler is clear from the narrative in the Cūlavaṃsa, and that he was a man of some learning is suggested by the epithet paṇḍita.[4] Besides, the Cūlavaṃsa states that he himself composed in the Māgadha tongue a letter, which was sent to the king of Arimaddana (Pagan) and that a peace treaty was concluded with that monarch.[5] Burmese Chronicles give no reference to this treaty. The Kalyāṇi inscriptions dated 1476 A.D., which were set up with the object of giving a ruling on the upōsatha,

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 12.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 9; LXXX, 1-14.

[3] Cv., LXXX, 18-26.

[4] Pjv., 107; Nks, 87, Rjv., 36.

[5] Cv., LXXX, 6-8. See Buddhadatta's corrections of Geiger's translation of the Cūlavaṃsa, U.C.R., VIII, 172-73.

and pavāraṇa as well as the manner of consecrating a sīmā do refer to a Buddhist embassy to Ceylon headed by Uttarajīva mahāthera in the reign of Parākramabāhu, which ultimately led to the establishment of the Sīhaḷa Saṃgha in Burma.[1] These records reflect cordial relations between the two countries, but contain no reference to the treaty of Vijayabāhu II. However, the Cūḷavaṃsa statement of Vijayabāhu's treaty, taken along with the data contained in the historical introduction of the inscriptions referred to above, will make it clear that Parākramabāhu's conflict with that country had not led to a permanent breach in the traditional friendship between Burma and Ceylon and indeed good relations were already restored. Friendly relations appear to have been restored not long after the conflict.

The Bōdhisattva qualities which Vijayabāhu is said to have had do not seem to have been of much avail, for his position on the throne was challenged from the time of his accession to power. Though the Chronicle fails to mention this episode, Vijayabāhu's inscription from Poḷonnaruva referred to above states that on the day after his consecration disturbances were caused by treacherous ministers (duṣṭāmātyayan) who became traitors (rājadrohivā), and that a general named Vijyāyān-tān-nāvan quelled the revolt and restored the kingdom to Vija-

---

[1] Ind. Ant., XXII (1893), 14; The Glass Palace Chronicle, 142 ff. also mentions this embassy of Uttavajīva, head of the Buddhist clergy in Burma in 1180, and states that five bhikkhus including Chapata, pupil of Uttarajīva, who studied the Three Piṭakas in Ceylon returned to Burma in 1190.

yabāhu.[1] The purpose of this epigraph is in fact to record a grant of land along with certain privileges in recognition of his loyal services. In spite of the services of this general who was on his side, opposition to his rule appears to have mounted seriously for, at the end of one year he was put to death by Mahinda of the Kuliṅga clan.[2] The Pūjāvaliya states that the latter put him to death on account of an affair, which Vijayabāhu is said to have had with Dīpanā - the daughter of a cowherd.[3] That opposition to Vijayabāhu's rule had arisen from a more deep-seated cause is evident, for we have already referred to the revolt which broke out on the day after his consecration. It would be clear from the events that followed, that from the death of Parākramabāhu the ministers and the generals and such other high officials were divided in their allegiance and in turn attempted to place on the throne princes of Pāṇḍyan or Kaliṅga descent, depending on the predilection of the factions concerned. It has been postulated that there was even a third party who preferred to have a Sinhalese prince on the throne.[4]

Mahinda VI who succeeded to the throne after putting Vijayabāhu II to death is said to belong to the Kuliṅga clan.[5] The Pūjāvaliya gives

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 30, p. 183, lines 24-27.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 15-17.

[3] Pjv., 107.

[4] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., V, NS. 174.

[5] Cv., LXXX, 15; Pjv., 107.

the name of this personage as Kesdā Kiliṃ Mihindā, and the Sinhalese text Siṃhala Bodhivaṃsa has the form Kiliṅgu in its reference to the Kuliṅga clan.[1] The first reference to Kuliṅga in the Mahāvaṃsa occurs in its account of the clans that came to Ceylon along with the Bodhi Tree. In that account Kuliṅgas are mentioned along with the Taraccha (hyena) and they appear to be clans of totemistic origin as the case could be with the Balibhojakas (crow), Lambakaṇṇas (hare) and Moriyas (peacock).[2] Geiger with good reason corrects Wijesinghe's translation, and has shown that the superficial similarity of the forms - Kuliṅga and Kaliṅga, should not lead to an equation of the two, for Kuliṅgas are mentioned as a distinct clan already in the older part of the Mahāvaṃsa.3 Kesadhātunāyaka appears to have been a title of distinction which, for instance, Parākramabāhu I bestowed on one of his trusted generals, Rakkha.[4] As such, Kesdā (kesadhātu) which is prefixed to his name indicates that he was a person of high rank at the time when Mahinda made his bid for kingship. His reign of five days obviously created little impression, for the Miṇipe Slab Inscription, which gives a list of the names of

---

[1] Siṃhala Bodhivaṃsa, 195.

[2] Cult. Cey. Med. Times, 26-27.

[3] Mv., XIX, 1-6.

[4] Cv., LXX, 278, 280.

kings who succeeded to the throne after Parākramabāhu I, omits his name altogether.[1] It is clear from the Cūlavaṃsa that he was not acceptable to the people or even to the army personnel who mattered in the politics of the day.[2]

Mahinda was succeeded by Nissaṅka Malla who put the former to death. The reign of Nissaṅka Malla, which lasted nine years, is a bright spot in the troubled history of this period. The most remarkable aspect of his rule, apart from his services to the laity and the Order, is the large number of epigraphs he set up - the largest number of inscriptions credited to any individual king in Ceylon. These records throw light on many aspects of his reign. The Cūlavaṃsa attributes to him the building of the Tooth Relic Temple in Polonnaruva, which Geiger thinks was merely a restoration of the one built by Parākramabāhu.[3] What lends support to such a view is the statement in the Pūjāvaliya that the construction of the daḷadāgeya was completed in sixty hours.[4] The Satmahal Pāsāda in Polonnaruva is generally attributed to this ruler, but here again we are far from certain whether the original construction was a work

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., V, pt. I, No. 12, p. 159, lines 33-37.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 15-17.

[3] Cv., LXXX, 19; Cv.Tr., II, p. 127, n.2. this claim is made in his inscriptions too.

[4] Pjv., 107.

of Nissaṅka Malla.[1] Jambukola Vihāra (Sinh. Dambulla), where he has left an epigraph, benefited from his munificence. That vihāra was made 'resplendent with walls and pillars shimmering in gold and silver, where the floor was of red lead, and the bricks of the roof were of gold, the wise (Monarch) had rebuilt and placed therein seventy three golden statues of the Master'.[2] Here one can note the obvious exaggeration, which is met with in his epigraphic records as well. His inscription engraved on a rock at the site refers to his embellishment of these caves and that they were named Suvannagiriguhā. Thus the restoration of that vihāra by this ruler is confirmed.[3] He made pilgrimages to places of religious importance such as Kälaniya, Mahagama and Mahiyaṅgana and Sämanola and these were perhaps a means to win the good will of the people.[4] Some of his inscriptions refer to the attempts he made to bring about the unification of the Saṃgha.[5] In this connection it is sufficient to note that the efforts of Vijayabāhu I and Parākramabāhu I to purify the Saṃgha had produced but temporary results. In this manner Nissaṅka Malla made an energetic attempt to help the

---

[1] Cv. Tr., II, p. 127, n.2.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 22-23.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., I, No. 9, p. 132, lines 24-25; II, No. 29, p.173, lines 29-31.

[4] Cv., LXXX, 24; Ep. Zeyl, II, No. 29, p. 173, lines 29-33; No. 25, p.147, line 1; p.111, lines 9-10.

[5] Ep. Zeyl., I, No. 9, p. 131, line 21; Ktk.Sng., 31.

Śāsana when it most needed royal patronage. However, that these services to help the course of Buddhism were not without a political motive is hinted at, when he appeals to the inhabitants of the country not to allow non-Buddhists such as the Cola and Kerala princes to aspire to the throne of Ceylon.[1] The position is even clearer when he brushes aside the claims of the people of Govikula and declares that the Kaliṅga line alone had a rightful claim to the throne of Ceylon.[2]

On the political plain Nissaṅka Malla seems to have maintained his authority throughout the island. The provenance of his inscriptions in widely scattered areas of the three kingdoms (tun-rajaya) shows that the impact of his administration was felt even in the outlying provinces.[3] It is, however, difficult to believe that the central authority could carry the weight of its command into the distant areas so effectively as it did in the days of Parākramabāhu I, but that Nissaṅka Malla tried his best to achieve that end is clear from the contents of his records. He travelled widely outside the capital and visited the out-lying provinces, and made an attempt to contact the people whose goodwill he desired to win.[4] In spite of these efforts, that

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 28, (B), p. 161, lines 8-10.

[2] Ibid., line 12 ff: p. 114, lines 21-23.

[3] C.J.S.G., II, p. 23, No. 386; A.I.C., Muller No. 152a. Ep. Zeyl., III, No. 35, p. 325 ff.; Ep. Zeyl., I, No. 9, p. 121 ff.

[4] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 14, p. 88 lines 11-12: No. 15, p. 94, lines 1-3: No. 17, p. 107, lines 5-10.

hard times had set in can be seen from some of his statements in his own epigraphs. We have already referred to his appeal to his subjects not to enthrone non-Buddhists such as the Cola and Kerala princes. This statement shows that threats to his power from external sources were not ruled out. This statement appears somewhat strange as the Sinhalese never had Cola or Kerala princes on the throne on their own choice. Keralas were an important element in the army, and when they turned rebellious royal authority was in great danger.[1] The Vēlaikkāra Inscription of Vijayabāhu I informs us that even after expelling the Colas from Ceylon at the end of a protracted struggle Vijayabāhu entrusted the Vēlakkāras with the important function of being the custodians of the Tooth Relic.[2] This is regarded as a recognition of their influence, which even Vijayabāhu had to reckon with. But, it is equally possible that Vijayabāhu preferred to have foreign mercenaries entrusted with this responsibility. Once the controlling hand of Parākramabāhu was removed these mercenary Vēlakkāras must have gathered greater confidence, and it is not strange if they even aspired to kingship On the other hand, those elements who were opposed to the Kalingas could make common cause with these aspirants to royalty. That in fact is what appears to have happened, for Nissaṅka Malla declares

---

[1] Cv., LX, 36-41: LXXIV, 44-46.

[2] Ep. Zeyl., II, 252-255; Ep. Ind., XVIII, 330-38.

'Those who join them and cause disturbances shall be called traitors'.[1] The exclusion of the Pāṇḍyas from this indictment of Nissaṅka Malla against the Coḷas and Keraḷas has been interpreted to mean that the statement was in point of fact aimed at the Pāṇḍyas themselves.[2] The danger from the Coḷas and Keraḷas could not have been underestimated, although the Pāṇḍya faction in Ceylon was a strong threat to the power of the Kaliṅgas in Ceylon. It would have been undiplomatic for Nissaṅka Malla to cast aspersions on the Pāṇḍyas, for the latter had close connections with the Sinhalese royalty.[3] Parākramabāhu's mahesī Līlāvatī was a princess of Pāṇḍyan stock,[4] and the latter queen was an influential factor in the country for she ascended the throne on three occasions shortly after the reign of Nissaṅka Malla. Even the Chronicle refers to them with reservations, so much so that even the invader Parākrama Pāṇḍya who occupied the throne at the time of Māgha's invasions, and who suffered at the hands of the latter, is referred to in complimentary language.[4] In these circumstances, we have no reason to be surprised at the Pāṇḍyas being excluded from the scope of Nissaṅka Malla's rebuke.

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 29, 163-64.

[2] J.R.A.S.Cey. Br., NS. V, 174.

[3] Cv., LIX, 41; also see Genealogical Table V, U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, after page 850.

[4] Cv., LXX, 51-53.

Nissaṅka Malla mentions another class of people, namely those of the Govikula, as being unfit to aspire to kingship.

> 'People of the Govi caste should never aspire to the dignity of kingship, (for this should be) like the crow aping the swan, /or/ the donkey the Saindhava steed, /or/ the worm the cobra king, /or/ the fire-fly the sun-shine, /or/ the snipe the elephant, /or/ the jackal the lion. However powerful the people of the Govi caste may be, they should not be elected /to rule/ the kingdom. Those who pay obeisance to persons of the same class as themselves and render them the honours due to kings, and those, too, who accept from them offices and titles shall indeed by called traitors. Such people with their families and their worldly possessions will be rooted out as soon as a royal prince appears on the throne.'[1]

What necessitated this indictment against the people of the Govikula is a moot point. The people of the Govikula represent in a broad sense the equivalent or counterpart of the Indian Vaiśya caste, engaged in agriculture, trade, commerce and arts and crafts.[2] By the time of Nissaṅka Malla this community seems to have increased its power and wealth and occupied positions of influence. Paranavitana has argued that kingship in Ceylon was of Vaiśya rather than Kṣatriya origin in his examination of some of the royal titles of the early Sinhalese kings.[3] Although that view has not gained ground it cannot be denied that the people of the Govikula were an important

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., II, p. 164.

[2] Geiger, Cult.Cey.Med.Times;30-33; M.B.Ariyapala, Society in Mediæval Ceylon, 290 ff.

[3] J.R.A.S., 1936, 444-462.

community. That this particular class had shown signs of ambition to elevate themselves to kingship would not be an unreasonable inference. It is relevant to note here that, when Māgha invaded Ceylon, a good deal of his ruthless attack appears to have been directed against this community. The Culavaṃsa possibly refers to the people of the Govikula, who had increased their wealth and power, when it says: 'After they had put fetters on the wealthy and rich people and had tortured them and taken away all their possessions, they made poor people of them'.[1] Their wealth appears to have consisted of 'villages and fields, houses and gardens, slaves and cattle and buffaloes' and so forth, and from this account we may infer that they were an important community in that society. Whereas Nissaṅka Malla adopted the peaceful method of appealing to the people not to elevate persons of the Govikula to kingship, Māgha resorted to violence and suppressed this class mercilessly. In the light of these circumstances, Nissaṅka Malla's indictment against the people of the Govikula appears to have been based on the fear of a threat to his power from that community.

While Nissaṅka Malla was faced with these odds it must have been a difficult task for him to maintain the unity of the country. He appealed to the people of Rohaṇa not to open themselves to the rebuke of the inhabitants of Māyāraṭa (Māyarattha) and Pihiṭiraṭa (Patitt-

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 64, 76.

hāraṭṭhaā), and this statement shows that special effort was necessary to hold that province together with the other two kingdoms.[1] The visits of the king to the tun rajaya (the three kingdoms, viz. Ruhuṇu, Māyā and Pihiṭi) and to such distant places in them as Yudaganāva, Kāḷaṇiya, Devinuvara, appear to be a recognition of the need to hold his kingdom together through immense personal effort.[2] To achieve that end he resorted to remind the people that he hailed from Siṁhapura in Kāliṅga, from where Vijaya, the first king of the Sinhalese, hailed and that he belonged to the same dynasty as Vijaya.[3] He tried to strengthen his position on the throne on the strength of this claim. Nissaṅka Malla also adds that he was invited to Ceylon by the kulajeṭu (Vijayabāhu II ?) and that he enjoyed the positions of āpā(ādipāda) and himiyā (svāmi) prior to his accession to the throne.[4] His statements in favour of the divinity of kingship in the style of Manu that a king is a god in human form and his comparison of 'an upright king' to a Buddha are but a link in a chain of measures which had the calculated objective of reconciling the people of Ceylon to the rule of the Kaliṅga

---

[1] C.I.S.G., II, p. 23, No. 386; Muller, A.I.C., No. 15 a; Ep. Zeyl. III, No. 35, p. 329-31.

[2] Ep. Zeyl, II No. 17, p. 111, lines 7-12, pp. 94, 95, 119, 126-27, 132-33, 140-41: Vol. III, 329-31.

[3] Ep. Zeyl. II No. 17, pp. 109-10, lines 4-7; p. 114, lines 22-23.

[4] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 17, pp. 109-10, lines 5-7.

line.[1] The bestowal of great tulābhāras and the building of almshouses in and outside Ceylon, shorn of the evident exaggeration in the relevant passages, must be treated as part of his programme to enhance his position and goodwill in the eyes of his subjects.[2]

It is especially noteworthy that Nissaṅka Malla is one of the very few kings in this period who was alive to the need of the restoration of the irrigation works, apart from embarking on new projects. The chronicle is silent on this aspect, but some of his inscriptions would make us believe that some restoration work was undertaken, perhaps with limited success.[3]

In the light of what has been stated in the foregoing paragraphs it may be inferred that Nissaṅka Malla, despite the stark realities of the political situation of his times, succeeded in giving the island more than a semblance of unity for nearly a decade. But extreme caution would be necessary before accepting his claims of conquests abroad. He claims to have exacted tribute from 'the Coḷa, the Pāṇḍya and various other countries'.[4] His general named Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Tāvurunāvan is stated to have offered his services for the conquest of Daṁbadiva but, before the general could

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 17, p. 113, lines 4-5; Laws of Manu, VII, 5, 7, 8.

[2] Ep. Zeyl., II, p. 79, lines 12-15, p. 88, lines 7 ff, p. 94, lines 11-17.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 17, p. 110, linn 20.

[4] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 25, p. 148; his other inscriptions repeat these episodes.

proceed far in this war the Pāṇḍya king and his mother are said to have surrendered their kingdom, 'leaving to us only a village that will be enough for our maintenance'.[1] It is recorded in his inscriptions that he crossed into the Pāṇḍya country twice accompanied by the fourfold army, and that he ascended the scale pans at Rāmeśvaram where a dēvālaya named Nissaṅkeśvara was built.[2] That is not all, for we are told that he formed friendly alliances with the princes of the Karṇāṭa, Nellūru, Gauḍa, Kaliṅga, Tiliṅga, Gurjara, Aramaṇa, Kamboja and other countries which were desirous of his friendship, but struck terror into those who did not desire such friendship.[3] From the nature of these statements, the reluctance that some scholars have shown to accept these great claims is justified.[4]

Unfortunately the Cūlavaṃsa has not a word on these conquests. Considering his services to the Order, it is strange that the chronicler should have observed silence on an aspect of his reign which could add to the glory of that ruler. The Sinhalese chronicles, too,

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 25, p. 148, B.

[2] Ibid., p. 152, D.

[3] Ibid., p. 152, C.

[4] Bell, A.S.C.A.R., 1903, p.17.

are silent on the exploits of Nissaṅka Malla in foreign lands.[1] What we may infer from this silence as well as the extravagant nature of his claims is that his belligerent intentions were hardly crowned with worthwhile success, even if we concede that he did cross over to South India, on the strength of his record at Rāmēsvaram.[2] At best, the position appears to be an attempt to dwell on reflected glory which perhaps lingered on from the days of Parākramabāhu I. It is repeatedly mentioned in several of his records that he chastised the rulers of Karṇāṭa, Nellūru, Gauḍa, Kaliṅgu, Ti(liṅgu), Gu(rjjara), and so forth, whoever did not desire his friendship, and caused tribute and princesses to be brought to his harem.[3] Paranavitana is of opinion that Nissaṅka Malla was backed by naval assistance from the Śrīvijaya empire, a contention which has already evoked serious criticism.[4] Even if Niśśaṅka Malla had a few princesses in his harem who came from some of these countries it need not cause surprise, for the Sinhalese kings had traditions of friendly relations with some of these countries, particularly from the time of Vijayabāhu I. Kaliṅga,

---

[1] Pjv., 107; Rjr., 36; Rjv.Tr. p. 52.

[2] C.J.S.G., II, 105-106; A.R.E., No. 90 of 1905; Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 17, p. 112, line 19; Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 26, p. 151 D: J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXI, 386.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 15, p. 94, lines 8-9; Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 17, p. 112, lines 18-19; Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 20, p. 129.

[4] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VI, p. 34; VIII, 125-40.

Karṇāṭa, Aramaṇa and Kamboja are especially noteworthy, and Sinhalese kings had matrimonial links with the royal houses of some of them.[1] If the rulers of these lands sent some of their princesses to Ceylon, it must have given ample scope for Niśśaṅka Malla to declare before his subjects that the countries concerned heeded to his command. On the other hand, we have already shown that Niśśaṅka Malla's task within his own kingdom was not an easy one, and there are clear signs of troubles he had to reckon with.[2] In these circumstances we would hesitate to concede to this monarch his eloquent claims to far flung conquests across the seas. That, however, is not to deny the credit due to him for the attempts he made to improve the lot of his subjects and to restore the Śāsana amidst great odds. Niśśaṅka Malla is undoubtedly the most noteworthy monarch among the successors of Parākramabāhu I, who ruled from Polonnaruva.

The Cūlavaṃsa and the Sinhalese Chronicles do not mention the manner in which the reign of Niśśaṅka Malla ended. We have no way of ascertaining whether he too was slain or deposed like nearly all his successors on the throne of Polonnaruva. If he came to a tragic end, it would not have escaped the notice of the author of the Pūjāvaliya. Niśśaṅka Malla was succeeded by his son Vīrabāhu,

---

[1] Cv., LIX, 29-30; LX, 24-27; LVIII, 8-10; LXXX, 6-8; LXXVI, 35.

[2] Ep. Zeyl. II, No. 17. B. p. 111, lines 7-10; C.J.S.G., II, p. 23, No. 386; A.I.C. No. 152(a); Ep. Zeyl., III, p. 329, 151-52.

who 'ruled for one night and fell to the power of death'.[1]

We learn from the Pūjāvaliya that Vīrabāhu was put to death by Tāvuru Senevirat because he was of 'unequal birth'.[2] We have the instance of Kassapa I (473-91) who was of 'unequal birth' and Moggallāna I (491-508) who was of 'equal birth' - both sons of Dhātusēna (455-73).[3] Kassapa's accession to the throne was preceded by the murder of his father, and many years of fighting with his brother of 'equal birth' marred his reign which saw little peace. It was considered necessary for a king to be of equal birth on the father's as well as the mother's side.[4] Sinhalese kings in their marriage alliances sought to live up to this prerequisite. In the epigraphs of the Sinhalese kings they took pains to make out that they were of 'equal birth'. As such, if the succession of Vīrabāhu was challenged on that accunt, we have to assume that he was a son of Nissaṅka Malla by one of the many princesses brought to his harem from foreign lands, who was not quite equal in rank according to the then prevalent notions. Here again the difficulty is the statement of Nissaṅka Malla that Vīrabāhu was 'my own legi-

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 27.

[2] Pjv., 107.

[3] Pjv., 99.

[4] U.C.H.C., I, pt. 1, 365.

timate son'.[1] As pointed out by B. J. Perera, the undue stress given by Nissaṅka Malla to this point was perhaps to make up for some inadequacy, and the Pūjāvaliya statement may not be unfounded. The fact that general Tāvuru, having put Vīrabāhu to death, raised Nissaṅka Malla's younger brother Vikramabāhu to the throne shows that he had no opposition to the Kaliṅga family as such but to the unfortunate prince Vīrabāhu. It is only a few years later that queen Kalyāṇavatī is said to have 'separated the four castes which have been mixed'.[2] - a statement which suggests that distinctions of birth must have mattered in the selection of nominees to the throne. Hence the demand for princes on the throne to be of 'equal birth' can be appreciated.

Vikramabāhu's reign was very brief and lasted only three months.[3] He was put to death by a prince called Coḍagaṅga referred to as a newphew (bhāgineyya) of Nissaṅka Malla, and he too could reign only nine months. The Upāsakajanalaṅkara mentions a Coḍagaṅga who is described as a Vañño Sāmanta in the Pāṇḍya country. The author of this Pali work states that this Coḍgaṅga built Vihāras

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl. II, No. 29, p. 172, line 12, yuvarajavä siṭi urehidā Vīrabāhu mahapāṇanvahanse.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 41; Geiger's translation of this strophe is too strong.

[3] Cv., LXXX, 28-29; also known as Erapatta, Ep. Zeyl., Vol. V. p. 161, line 36. Referred to as āpānanvahanse and associated with the tulā-bhāras of Nissaṅka Malla, Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 15, p. 94, lines 13-14.

for Buddhist monks who left Ceylon when the island was ravaged by the Tamils. This chieftain appears to have been a Pāṇḍyan feudatory. Therefore, he may not be identified with the Coḍagaṅga who was the sister s son of Niśśaṅka Malla.[1]

At this stage we may draw attention to a prominent feature of the political life of this period, namely, the emergence of several powerful generals as a determining factor in the succession to the throne. One such general, on whom Niśśaṅka Malla himself leaned very heavily was Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Tāvurunāvan, who figures prominently in the account of the Pāṇḍyan conquests contained in the epigraphs of that monarch.[2] Shortly before the accession of Niśśaṅka Malla to the throne a general called Vijayāyān-tān-nāvan, who is stated to have protected the person of the king from Ruvan-daṁbu, served Vijayabāhu II (1186-87), the unfortunate successor of Parākramabāhu I.[3] In an inscription of Vijayabāhu II it is recorded that this general quelled a revolt which broke out on the day after his consecration.[4] Two other important personages were Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Kit-Senevi, who deposed Coḍagaṅga

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 29; Upāsakajanālaṅkāra, see verses in the Colophon.

[2] Ep. Zeyl. II, No. 17, p. 112, line 15 ff, 120.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 30, pp. 183-184.

[4] Ep. Zeyl. II, No. 30, p. 183, line 24 ff.

to place queen Līlāvatī - mahesī of Parākramabāhu I - on the throne, and the general called Lak Vijaya Siṅgu Senevi Ābonāvan, who raised successively Sāhasamalla and evidently Kalyāṇavatī and Dharmāsōka, too, to the throne.[1] Although these are the more important personages who figure prominently in the lithic records and the Chronicles, there must have been others who played less significant roles. There is no doubt that these generals were a power behind the throne, the rulers themselves having hardly any opportunity to assert their authority without incurring the wrath of the generals who helped them to the throne.

Opinion among scholars as to the identification of these generals has not been unanimous. The fact that their activities cover a comparatively brief period of about twenty years, along with the similarity of the forms of their names and titles, and the lack of more precise data on their background, are some of the difficulties one is faced with in an attempt at their identification. Wickramasinghe was of opinion that Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Tāvurunāvan, Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Kit-Senevi and Lak Vijaya Siṅgu Senevi Ābonāvan all refer to one and the same general.[2] Paranavitana has expressed the view that Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Ābonā who placed Sāhasamalla on the

---

[1] Pjv., 107-108; Cv., LXXX, 30, 33-34; A.I.C., 157; Ep. Zeyl., II, 224-299.

[2] Ep. Zeyl, II, No. 32, 191.

throne, and Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Tāvurunāvanvan who led Nissaṅka Malla'a expedition to the Pāṇḍya country and who was also in charge of building the Vaṭadāgē at Polonnaruva, refer to one and not two personages.[1] This was in fact the opinion of Geiger too.[2] The view that the personages in question are three different individuals has also been expressed.[3]

With regard to the identification of Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Ābōnāvan with Āyasmanta of the Cūlavaṃsa and Eḷulu Ābō-Senevirat of the Pūjāvaliya and the Rājāvaliya there cannot be serious difficulty.[4] According to the Cūlavaṃsa Āyasmanta belonged to the Khandhāvara-kula.[5] The Chronicles do not give further references to the Khandhāvara family, but Sinhalese literary works of the fifteenth century contain allusions to members of this family. The Sāḷaḷihiṇi Sandēsaya, a poem composed in the thirty-fifth year of the reign of Parākramabāhu VI, by Toṭagamuvē Rāhula Thera - one of the greatest literary figures of that century - states that its author belonged to the Kaṅdavuru-

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., II, 101, 167, 176; Ep. Zeyl., IV, No. 10, 75-6.

[2] Cv.Tr., II, p. 130, n.2.

[3] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. V, 177 ff.

[4] Cv., LXXX, 33-34; Pjv., 107-108; Rjv.Tr., 52-53.

[5] Cv., LXXX, 37-38.

kula (Pali: Khandhāvara-kula),[1] and that he was like unto a gem (set) lamp in the mansion of the Kandavuru family. In the Kāvya-ṡēkharaya, another literary work of the same author, the latter is again referred to as a member of the Kandavuru-kula.[2] The name suggests that they were worshippers of god Skandha.[3] Although this family appears to have played a prominent role in the politics of the troubled days that followed the death of Parākramabāhu I, its generals are not heard of again. The tragic end of the generals in question, as we shall see in the sequel, appears to have led to the political eclipse of that family.

As we noted earlier, this general is called Āyasmanta in the Cūlavaṃsa, Lak-Vijaya-Singu-Senevi-Ābōnāvan in the inscriptions, and Ẹlulu Ābō Senevirat in the Pūjāvaliya. One can clearly recognize the Sinhalese equivalent of Āyasmanta - 'one who possesses long life' in Ābō. The Sinhalese word 'ā' is used in the sense of 'life span'

---

[2] Kāvyaṡekharaya-Sandeṡaya, see Colophon.

[2] Kāvyaṡekharaya, canto I, verse 23.

[3] Malalasekara, Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, 712.

(Pali: āya; Skt: Āyuṣ), and 'bō' is the same as 'bohō' (Pali: bahu) which means 'much' or 'many', an adjective indicating quantity.[1] As such Āyasmanta of the Cūlavaṃsa could be identified with the Ābō Senevirat of the Pūjāvaliya and Ābhāvan of the inscription referred to above. However we are not free of all difficulties, for the general in question belonged to the Khandhāvara-kula according to the Pali Chronicle, and to the Lolu-pälä-kula according to the epigraph of Sāhasamalla.[2] The form Lolu-pälä-(kula) finds no mention in the lithic records of this period or in the Chronicles, but the Pūjāvaliya appears to preserve the name of the general's family as given in the epigraph, when it refers to him as Ēlulu-Ābō-Senevirat.[3] The relation between the two forms of the name of his family as given in the two sources, cannot be satisfactorily explained in the present state of our knowledge. But, as will be shown in the sequel, there is no discrepancy with regard to the events with which he was associated, in the literary works as well as in the epigraph, and we may hold that Āyasmanta and Ābonāvan are one and the same general.

---

[1] Sorata, Sumaṅgala Śabdakoṣaya, 114; Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gāṭapadaya, ed. Jayatilaka, 1932, p. 63; see also Paranavitana, Ep. Zeyl., V, 151-52.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 37; Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 36, 225, lines 16-17; the word Dūṭṭāṭi of which the reading is uncertain precedes Ābonāvan, p. 225.

[3] Pjv., 107.

One of the arguments adduced by Wickramasinghe in favour of the view that Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Ābonāvan and Lak-Vijaya-Kit-Senevi refer to the same person is that Āyasmanta (Skt. Āyuṣmat) is an honorific title applied especially to senior Buddhist monks and elderly persons in high positions and that Senevi-Abonāvan would mean 'the venerable general'.[1] Wickramasinghe is probably right in his observation, but that is, however, no argument in favour of the supposition that Kit-Senevi and Ābonāvan denote the same person. On the other hand, even if Ābonāvan were an epithet, by common usage it may have acquired the significance of a proper name when it was applied to that general. Two other points he makes are the close similarity of the two names Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Kit Senevi and Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Ābonāvan, and the contemporaneity of the bearers of these names, as well as the similarity of the role they played in the politics of a period of only twelve years. The similarity of nomenclature is no bar to differentiating the individuals in question. Some of the early Sinhalese kings are known to us in their epigraphs with almost identical titles; Duṭṭha-Gāmaṇī Abhaya and Vaṭṭa-Gāmaṇī Abhaya both appear in the inscriptions attributed to them as Devanapiya Maharaja Gamaṇi Abaya, and there are of course other examples.[2] Parākramabāhu I had several generals with the names Kitti and Rakkha,

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., II, 191.

[2] Mv., XXXIII, 4-16; Parker, Ancient Ceylon, 439, No. 53-54; A.S.C.A.R., 1934, s.71, p.18, A.S.C.A.R.1935, 10.

with titles that are similar, but they were different individuals.[1] Besides, the contemporaneity of the generals with whom we are concerned and the similarity of nomenclature cannot be considered serious arguments, for, during these twenty years events were swift-moving, with kings frequently deposed or assassinated, and the brevity of the period in which they appear is therefore not a difficulty either. Even powerful generals would have required extraordinary ability to weather these storms, in this brief period of about two decades. The fate of the generals appears to have been not so different from that of the kings on an ever uncertain throne.

So far as the name Kitti is conerned, it may be regarded as a personal name - a name borne by Vijayabāhu in his early years, and by many Sinhalese generals. The view that the three forms of the names of the generals, Tāvurunāvan, Kit Senevi and Ābonāvan, all refer to one and the same person meets with difficulties. The Pūjāvaliya leaves no room to equate Tāvuru Senevirat, who figures there as the slayer of Vīrabāhu, with Eḷulu Ābō Senevirat who elevated Sāhasamalla, Kalyāṇavatī and Dharmāsoka to the throne, with the Kit Senevi who slew Coḍagaṅga and placed Parākramabāhu's queen Līlāvatī on the throne.[2] The author of the Pūjāvaliya was removed from these events only by

---

[1] Cv., LXX, 278-284; LXXVI, 59ff; LXXIV, 178-180, 89-98; LXXII, 161-163, 41, 55 ff.

[2] Pjv., 107-108; Cv., LXXX, 27-44.

about sixty years, and the latter text and for that matter even the Cūlavamsa mention them as three different individuals.[1] B. J. Perera has rightly pointed out that these generals figure in distinctly different episodes.[2] Moreover, if they are given separate identity based on the order of their occurence in the lithic records, that would be in harmony with the chronological order in which they eppear in the Chronicles. Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Tāvurunāvan (Pjv.: Tāvuru Senevirat) figures in the epigraphs of Niśśaṅka Malla as one of his trusted generals, and as the slayer of Vīrabāhu in the Chronicles, and his name is not mentioned in the inscriptions or the Pūjāvaliya there after. Kit Senevit (Pjv.: Kit Senevirat) figures as the general who deposed Coḍagaṅga and placed Līlāvatī on the throne.[3] Āyasmanta (Pjv.: Eḷulu Abō) is met with in the Chronicles as the general who was instrumental in elevating Kalyāṇavatī and Dharmāsoka to the throne and deposing the former as well as Sāhasamalla, who also appears to have risen to the sovereignty of Ceylon with his aid, according to the epigraph of the latter.[4] Sāhasamalla's inscription is in no way in conflict with the narrative in the Chronicles

---

[1] Pjv., 107-108.

[2] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. V, 177.

[3] Cv., LXXX, 30-31; Pjv., 107.

[4] Cv., LXXX, 32-44; Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 36, 224-26.

with regard to the activities of general Āyasmanta (Ābō), but gives us the additional information not contained in the Chronicles, that this general was responsible not only for the deposition of Sāhasamalla, but also for his accession to the throne amidst great opposition. It is very unlikely that the Pūjāvaliya would have used three different names in the narrative of events which were linked together in a comparatively brief period, if the same individual was meant. It has also been pointed out that, while Āyasmanta belonged to the Khandhāvara-kula, Kit Senevi was a member of the Ruvanpā-kula as given in the Sasadāvata.[1]

In support of this position, it may also be observed that, while Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Tāvurunāvan was a loyal and ardent supporter of the Kaliṅga line, Kit Senevi upheld the claims of queen Līlāvatī who was of Pāṇḍya stock, and the two generals appear as members of two rival factions - those of the Kaliṅgas and the Pāṇḍyas. This, however, is not to deny the possibility that a general could change his allegiance from one faction to another, but in this instance that was very unlikely. Hence we may infer that Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Tāvurunāvan, Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Kit-Senevi, and Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Ābonāvan were three separate generals who played a prominent role in the power politics of this period.

---

[1] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. V, 178; Sasadāvata, 12.

We have so far not considered the identity of the general Vijayā-yān-tān-nāvan, who served Vijayabāhu II faithfully and quelled a revolt which broke out on the day after his consecration as recorded in the only extant epigraph of this monarch.[1] Whether he was identical with the general of Nissaṅka Malla, Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Tāvurunāvan, whom we have already considered, is difficult to establish, but the probability is that they were two different generals, who served the Kaliṅga family faithfully. Tāvuru, which forms part of the name of Nissaṅka Malla's general, distinguishes the latter from Vijayabāhu's general. Wickramasinghe proposes to identify Vijayāyān-tān-nāvan with the general Baṇḍārapota Pirivatubim Vijayāyān-nāvan, who figures in Kalyāṇavatī's inscription at the Ruvanvāli Dāgāba,[2] referred to in that record as a powerful minister even at the time of Parākramabāhu I.[3] This general, however, does not figure in the politics of the intervening period of about fifteen years, which had seen the rise and fall of five rulers on the throne up to the accession of queen Kalyāṇavatī. This identification which is quite probable would lead us to assume that the general in questionwas forced into the background and suffered a temporary eclipse of power in the intervening period.

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 30, 182-83.

[2] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., VII, pt. III (1882), 181-85.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 30, 181.

From Vijayabāhu's inscription referred to above we learn that this ruler came from Kaliṅga to take over the reins of government in Ceylon, on the invitation of Parākramabāhu I.[1] In that record it is stated that Vijayāyān-tān-nāvan[2] protected the person of the king from Ruvandaṁbu, a place which must be sought in Kaliṅga where Vijayabāhu hailed from. It is clear from this statement that this general came over to Ceylon from the mainland, along with Vijayabāhu II.

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 30, 183, lines 15-24.

[2] .Wickramasinghe has noted a suggestion of Sir D. B. Jayatilaka that yān-tān-nāvan may mean the 'chief of the bed chamber'. (Ep. Zeyl. II, p. 179, note 2.)). The word yān in Sinhalese literature conveys among others the meaning 'bed' (Dal.S., 49 Kavsilumiṇa, v.598), tān may be the same as Skt. sthāna, and nāvan as Skt. nāyaka or nātha. The word nāvan is frequently mentioned in Sinhalese inscriptions and literature as part of personal names and titles. Budalnāvan, Ep. Zeyl., II, p. 225, lines 18-19; V, 21, B, line 2; Loke arakmenāvan, IV, 87, line 4; Dampasaṅgināvan, Dal.S., 54. Kavsilumiṇa, op.cit., verse 598 gives yahan tan (Skt. śayanasthāna) for 'bed chamber'. Therefore there is some basis for this suggestion. But if there was such an important officer in the Sinhalese court, then we should expect reference to him in the inscriptions and the literature of the period. However, no reference to an officer called Yān-tān-nāvan has been found. In this connection attention may be drawn to a number of South Indian Inscriptions (S.I.I., XIII, No. 330, 175: No. 333, 125: No. 100, 48: A.R.E., No. 27 of 1922: No. 321 of 1927) where the term Tennavan occurs as a prefix to personal names, indicating their southern origin. Though it may appear that there is a connection between the Sinhalese term and the Tamil word Tennavan there is no basis on which it could be confirmed. Thus both these suggestions must remain tentative in the present state of our knowledge.

The word Tāvuru, which occurs as part of the name of Niśśaṅka Malla's general Tāvurunāvan has given rise to similar speculation, but so far no satisfactory explanation has been found. Paranavitana has hinted at the possibility of a Malayan origin for this word, but the term yet remains unexplained.[1] The Sinhalese word tāvuru or tahavuru would be the equivalent of Sanskrit sthāvara which means 'firm'.[2] From this context it can of course be postulated that Tāvurunāvan conveyed the sense of 'firm leader or general', but this would not preclude the possibility that the word goes back to some Tamil origin which is now obscure.

The data are unfortunately very limited so that it is impossible to arrive at finality on their identification or origin. If the Tamil garb of their nomenclature is conceded, it would not be unreasonable to believe that at least some of these generals who played so prominent a role in the politics of this period were of South Indian origin. We have already seen that the South Indian element in the Sinhalese military organisation was quite considerable. So far as general Vijayāyān-tān-nāvan is concerned, we can be fairly certain that he came from the mainland as appears from the Polonnaruva Inscription of Vijayabāhu II.[3] Perhaps he was not the only one of that kind.

---

[1] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VII, 33-34.

[2] Sorata, Sumaṅgala Śabdakoṣaya, 367, 368; Sidat Sangarava, 81; Dhampiyā Aṭuvā Gätapadaya, 128.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 30, 182-183.

We may now return to our survey of the history of this period in which the generals whose identity was considered above played a leading role. Tāvuru Senevirat, having slain Vīrabāhu, appears to have placed Vikramabāhu on the throne.[1] According to the Cūlavaṃsa Vikramabāhu was a younger brother of Niśśaṅka Malla.[2] From the Hāṭadāgē Vestibule Wall Inscription of the latter we learn that Vikramabāhu held the position of āpā in the reign of Niśśaṅka Malla.[3] He was also associated with the tulābhāras which the latter claims to have held.[4] In spite of his association with the royal family and possibly also with the administration during the reign of his elder brother, he was not equal to the task before him. After a brief reign of three months he was put to death by Coḍagaṅga.

Some manuscripts of the Pūjāvaliya give Vikramabāhu a reign of three years (tun avuruddak). This is obviously a corruption in the text, for a copyist could have easily mistaken tun vasak (තුන් වසක් = three years) for tun masak (තුන් මසක් = three months), which the original text contained. The length of Vikramabāhu's reign, therefore may be taken as three months as given in the Cūlavaṃsa and the

---

[1] Pv., p. 107.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 28.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 15, 94, lines 13-14.

[4] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 15, 94, lines 12-16.

more reliable manuscripts of the Pūjāvaliya.[1]

Both these sources are in agreement that Coḍagaṅga, who put Vikramabāhu to death, was a sister's son of Nissaṅka Malla (Pali: bhāgineyya, Sinh: bāṇa).[2] Coḍagaṅga reigned for only nine months for he was put to death by general Kitti to whom we have already referred.[3] General Kitti placed queen Līlāvatī - the first mahesī of Parākramabāhu I on the throne.

Geiger notes that the Rājāvaliya mentions Coḍagaṅga as the general who carried on the government for three years for queen Līlāvatī, and that Kitti is not mentioned at all in that text.[4] But the printed text of the Rājāvaliya contains no such discrepancy when it states: 'After him, the Commander of the Army put Coḍaṅgaṅga to death, and caused the kingdom to be administered for three years by the principal queen of (the late) king Parākramabāhu'.[5] The commander of the army in question can be no other but general Kitti referred to by name both in the Cūlavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya.[6] Hence, we see no discrepancy between the Pali Chronicle and the Sinhalese Chronicle at this stage of the narrative.

---

[1] Pjv., 107, note 7; Cv., LXXXX, 28.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 29; Pjv., 107.

[3] Cv., LXXX, 30-31; Pjv., 107.

[4] Cv.Tr., II, p. 129, note 4.

[5] Rjv., 52.

[6] See above nde 3.

From the death of Niśśaṅka Malla up to the accession of queen Līlāvatī to the throne we have seen the tragic end of three Kaliṅga princes within one year. We have also referred to the threats to the continuation of the Kaliṅga dynasty, which Niśśaṅka Malla appears to have foreseen and attempted to remedy. If the power of the Kaliṅga family was challenged by the faction that desired to have a Pāṇḍyan prince on the throne, as well as by the growing importance of the Govi-kula and such external elements as the Coḷas and the Keraḷas, then that family appears to have been seriously weakened in its efforts at meeting the mounting opposition from these quarters by the disunity within the royal family itself. The murder of Vikramabāhu by Coḍagaṅga reveals serious disunity within the royal family, and that agreement on the succession was difficult to achieve, a factor which must have added to the strength of the opposing elements. Though we cannot be certain, it is possible that Coḍagaṅga and Vikramabāhu were the two Kaliṅga princes named Coḷangaṅga and Vikkantabāhu, who lived at the court of Gajabāhu II.[1] This identification is not improbable, for we have already seen that at least Vikramabāhu was previously associated in the administration of the country in the capacity of Upā, during the reign of Niśśaṅka Malla. Hence, if these princes with their associations at the court spread over many years harboured ambition to succeed to the throne, it would not be surprising. And

---

[1] Cv., LXX, 238.

Vikramabāhu as Nissaṅka Malla's brother, and Coḍagaṅga as the latters sister's son, could both point to precedents in support of their claims.[1] These rival claims and the means adopted to achieve them had unfortunate consequences that weakened the Kaliṅga family in particular, and added to the general political instability in the island.

The reign of queen Līlāvatī lasted three years, and during this period the real authority must have been exercised by general Kitti, who elevated her to the throne. The fact that she occupied the throne on two more occasions subsequently would show that she was acceptable to the courtiers and the generals who sponsored her. Līlāvatī was the first mahesī of Parākramabāhu I, the memory of whose greatness was still fresh in the minds of the people, and on that account she is likely to have wielded considerable influence in the country.

Queen Līlāvatī is referred to as a member of the Solar as well as the Lunar dynasties.[2] Being a daughter of Siri-Vallabha and Sugalā, she was properly speaking of Pāṇḍya stock, and the Dāṭhāvaṃsa - a literary work written in her reign positively states that she was

---

[1] Geiger, Cult.Cey.Med.Times, 114-115, para 106; Paranavitana, C.J.S.G., II, 235-40.

[2] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 33, 193, lines 5-6; Cv., LXXX, 50; Sasadāvata, v. 13.

of the Paṇḍuvaṃsa.[1] General Kitti, therefore, was a protagonist of the Pāṇḍya faction as against Tāvurunāvan who, we have seen, was an ardent supporter of the Kaliṅga family. What fate overtook Tāvurunāvan ultimately is not known from our sources, but the probability is that he either perished, or was forced to the background in the turmoil that led to the emergence of general Kitti and the Pāṇḍya faction who, for a time, gained the upper hand.

Though the Cūlavaṃsa would have us believe that she ruled 'without mishap' (nirupaddavaṃ)[2] and her inscriptions state that the people and the Buddhist Order were in a 'peaceful state',[3] there is some reason to believe that her reign was disturbed by foreign invasions, quite apart from the threats of the factions who wished to have a Kaliṅga prince on the throne. Paranavitana has drawn attention to a verse in the Sasadāvata, a poem composed under the patronage of Līlāvatī's Prime Minister, general Kitti, where the latter is praised as 'a lion in destroying the pride of the herd of elephants - the Colas'.[4] The Paraphrase of Sasadāvata, in justifying the praise of Kitti, adds that

---

[1] Dāṭhāvaṃsa, I, v.5; see Genealogical Table, Cv.Tr., I, p. 358.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 30-31.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., I, No. 14, 180, lines 6-7.

[4] Sasadāvata, v.11, Sahadap soligajamulu - daladap sun kesara van; J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXI, 384-87.

he was like unto a lion in destroying the herd of elephants - the Colas, for he defeated the latter on three occasions. Once they are said to have landed at Māvaṭutoṭa and marched up to Anurādhapura, and on the second occasion having landed at Salāvattoṭa they are said to have marched up to Śrīpura. The Paraphrase adds that on each of these occasions general Kitti defeated the Cola invaders.[1]

Unfortunately Līlāvatī's inscriptions do not refer to these episodes. According to one of her inscriptions, however, 'By creating a council of wise, brave and faithful ministers, she has freed her own kingdom from the dangers (arising) from other kingdoms'.[2] One may wonder whether this contains a hint of these calamities which marred her reign. But it would be unsafe to give this passage such an interpretation as 'other kingdoms' (para-maṇḍala) can simply mean the other two principalities, namely Māyāraṭha and Rohaṇa, a probability which is made the more likely by the reference to her attainment to the sovereignty of the Tri-Siṃhala, in the early portions of the same record.[3] Moreover 'paramaṇḍala' is also

---

[1] Sasadāvata, pp. 4-5., for Eng.Tr. of this passage see J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXI, 385.

[2] Ep. Zeyl., I, No. 14, p.180, lines 7-10.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., I, p. 180, lines 6-7.

found in the Cūlavaṃsa and in inscriptions in the sense of 'the other principality'.[1] Hence, we are reluctant to consider the passage in that epigraph as a reflection of the events in question.

Līlāvatī's Coḷa contemporary in the mainland appears to have been Kulōttuṅga III, whose initial regnal year has been placed about the year 1178, and whose last known date from his records is his fortieth year, which would be 1217.[2] The three-year reign of Līlāvatī has been placed between the year 1197 and 1200.[3] Kulōttuṅga III has been referred to as the last great Coḷa Monarch and, like his predecessors Rajādhirāja II, he tried zealously to maintain the integrity of the Coḷa empire, which was shaking before the growing imperialism of the Pāṇḍyas and the rebellious feudatories.[4] Prasastis of this ruler from the ninth year onwards claim victories over Ceylon. An inscription of his ninth year from Cidambaram says that Iḷagam was subdued and that the Siṅgaḷa soldiers had their noses cut off and rushed into the sea.[5] An inscription of the sixteenth year from Tiruviḍamarudūr refers to an order of Kulōttuṅga to 'capture Iḷam in the South so that the Tennavar (Southerners: Pāṇḍya,

---

[1] Cv., LXIV, 58-60; Galpota Inscription of Nissanka Malla distinctly refers to his kingdom as svamaṇḍala, and those of the others as paramaṇḍala, viz. Ruhuṇu and Māyā, Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 17, p.111, lines 7-9, see also Ep. Zeyl., I, No. 14, p. 180, line 9.

[2] The Colas, 375, 379.

[3] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 846.

[4] The Colas, 375 ff.

[5] A.R.E., 547 of 1902; S.Ind.Ins. III, 86; Nellore Inscriptions, N.85.

Kerala and Siṅgala ?) may come and prostrate themselves, and the head of the Siṅgalavan may be cut off, fill the wavy sea to make a causeway'.[1] A record from Tirumaṇikuli dated in his twenty-first year says that Kulōttuṅga adorned with his feet the crown of the Ceylonese king (Iḷattān) in order that he may prosper.[2] As late as his thirty-fourth year Kulōttuṅga claims to have conquered Ceylon in a record from Puḍukoṭṭah state.[3]

Paranavitana states that Kulōttuṅga's inscriptions from his twelfth year to his twentyninth year refer to the conquest of Ceylon.[4] Properly speaking his claims to the conquest of Ceylon extend beyond that date to his thirtyfourth year, as known from the Puḍukoṭṭah inscriptions referred to above. The earliest mention of victories over Ceylon is in fact not his twelfth but his tenth year.[5] If the initial regnal year of Kulōttuṅga is placed at 1178, the period of these references would be 1188 to 1222, a period which covers the reigns of thirteen kings of Ceylon from the commencement of the reign of Nissaṅka Malla right up to the reign of Māgha.[6]

---

[1] A.R.E., 288 ot 1907, The Colas, 380 ff.

[2] A.R.E., 170 of 1902.

[3] 163, 166 of Puḍukottai Inscriptions.

[4] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXI, 384-387.

[5] Nellore Inscriptions, N.85.

[6] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 508-21, 846.

It is not impossible that the country was invaded by the Tamils during this period of political instability. The Cūlavaṃsa and a few inscriptions make vague references to such invasions, but do not give us sufficient data to warrant definite conclusions. The Miṇipe Slab Inscription of the army commander Bhāma and the Bōpiṭiya Slab Inscription of queen Kalyāṇavatī speak of the Tamil menace in the latter's reign.[1] The Miṇipe Slab Inscription records that in the eighth year of Kalyāṇavatī, Tamil forces landed in Ceylon, destroyed the minister Āti, and 'swept over the whole of Laṅkā in the manner of world consuming flames at the end of an aeon having destroyed the entire social structure and the religious organisation'.[2] Calculating from the certain date of the accession of Sāhasamalla which took place in the year 1200,[3] the eighth year of Kalyāṇavatī would be 1210, in which these Tamil forces would have landed in Ceylon. Now this would show that the claims of Kulōttuṅga to have conquered Ceylon are not mere stylistic exaggerations, but that they have some claim to the truth. As the claims of Kulōttuṅga to have conquered Ceylon date back to a

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., V, No. 12, 158-59; Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 32, p. 192, the word kandavura is translated as 'stronghold'; see, however, Pjv., 117, 131 where this term refers to Polonnaruva.

[2] Ep. Zeyl., V, No. 12, p. 160.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 36, p. 220, J.R.A.S., 1909, 331; U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 846.

period much anterior to the eighth year of Kalyāṇavatī, it is not unlikely that he invaded Ceylon more than once. Perhaps the allusion in the Sasadāvata and the details given in its sanne referred to above, contain a reiteration of such an invasion, which could very probably have taken place in the confusion that followed the death of Nissaṅka Malla and continued into the reign of Līlāvatī, in which they took place according to that text. Nilakanta Sastri hesitates to give credit to the Sasadāvata reference as well as to the claims of Kulōttuṅga on the ground that they are too vague.[1] The caution shown by Nilakanta Sastri is very often justified, for the Sinhalese kingsas well as the Coḷas made extravagant claims to conquests, often without foundation. But in this instance, the details given in the Sasadāvata Sanne coupled with the troubled political situation at the time are too significant to be dismissed. It is true that Kulōttuṅga was too preoccupied with the domestic front in the suppressinn of turbulent feudatories and guarding against the rising power of the Pāṇḍyas, and the claims of conquests in Malay Peninsula would be unfounded, for they receive no confirmation from that quarter.[2] But we have seen the reverses suffered by the forces of Parākramabāhu I in South India at the hands of the Coḷas, and in

---

[1] The Coḷas, 412, note 76.

[2] The Coḷas, 377-398.

continuation of the success of Rājādhirāja II, his predecessor, if Kulōttuṅga raided Ceylon by way of retaliation making capital out of the political confusion in the island, it could not be regarded as an improbable course of events. The invasions themselves would not have produced marked dividends for the Coḷas as in the days of Rājēndra I (1012-44) at the heyday of Coḷa imperialism, but they would have tended to aggravate the political instability which then prevailed in Ceylon. However, this form of chastisement would have given some justification for Kulōttuṅga to boast in his records that he was a conqueror of Ceylon.

Regarding Līlāvatī's successor Sāhasamalla, all that we learn from the Cūlavaṃsa is that he was of the Okkāka family and that he ruled two years.[1] The Sinhalese Chronicles do not add to our knowledge of this ruler either. The Rājāvaliya which refers to him as a king of the Okkāka family and not by name, gives him a reign of nine years, an unlikely length in view of the circumstances which preceded and followed his accession to the throne.[2] Fortunately this ruler has left behind an important inscription which gives useful information pertaining to his reign not contained in any other source.[3] We are told that he was born in Siṃhapura as a son of king

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 32.

[2] Pjv., 107; Rjv., 43.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 36, 219-29.

Śrī Jayagopa of the Kaliṅga Cakravarti Dynasty by queen Lokamahādevī, and adds that he was a brother of Nissaṅka Malla.[1] Obviously, Sāhasamalla was a son of Śrī Jayagopa - the father of Nissaṅka Malla, by a different queen, namely Lokamahādevī. It is stated that on the death of his brother Nissaṅka Malla, Lolupälä-kuḷu Dūtäṭi Ābonāvan, an adhigār of Ceylon, in collaboration with his friend Lolupälä-kuḷu Budal-nāvan, who were desirous of reinstating the Kaliṅga family on the throne of Ceylon, sent to Siṃhapura a Kaliṅga noble named Mallikārjuna, and invited Sāhasamalla to come over and occupy the throne of Ceylon. In response to this request the latter set out from Siṃhapura, and after two years during the course of which the adversaries who were opposed to the succession of Sāhasamalla to the throne were subjugated, he became king. We learn that during these two years Sāhasamalla had to remain at Kahakoṇḍapaṭṭanam (Taṅgakoṇḍapaṭṭanam?) in the Coḷa country until his supporters referred to above suppressed the opposition to his succession and made the conditions favourable for his arrival in the island. In recognition of their services Ābonāvan was granted the rank of senevirat and was made Prime Minister (agra-mantrī). This minister was granted land and other riches, while his mother was given the title Laṅkātilaka-mahādevī.

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., II, 224-25, lines 1-12.

In addition to these data, this record contains a very important detail, namely the exact date of his accession to the throne, as Wednesday, the 12th day of the waxing moon in /the month of/ Binara after the expiration of 1743 years, 3 months, and 27 days of the Buddhist era.[1] This is indeed the first known instance of the use of the Buddhist era in dating a public document of which the date has been satisfactorily established. Fleet has worked out this date and has arrived at the result that his accession took place on Wednesday, 23rd August 1200, which is regarded as a definitely fixed point in the later chronology of Ceylon.[2]

From this account it appears that Līlāvatī would have had to face serious opposition from the generals, who worked hard to uphold the cause of the Kaliṅga princes. That would strengthen the possibility of the Colas having made capital out of that situation to invade Ceylon. We have also referred to the general Ābonāvan of this record earlier, who identification was considered above.[3]

We receive no further information on Laṁkādhikāra Lolupälä-kulu Budalnāvan, who collaborated with Ābonāvan to promote the cause

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 36, p. 225 B, lines 9-12.

[2] J.R.A.S., 1909, 327, 331.

[3] Cv., LXXX, 33-34; Pjv., 107-108.

of Sāhasamalla. He belonged to the same family as Ābonāvan.[1] In the Panākaḍuva Copper Plate Inscription of Vijayabāhu I, we meet a personage called Ruhuṇu Daḍanāyaka Sitnarubim Budalnāvan, who looked after Vijayabāhu and his family in the days of adversity, when that royal family fled in fear of the Coḷas, who had taken control of Rājaraṭṭha.[2] In that record, however, the family to which Vijayabāhu's benefactor belonged is not indicated. It is not improbable that the Budalnāvan of Sāhasamalla's record was a descendant of that family, which protected the royal family during the time of Vijayabāhu I. Budalnāvan of Vijayabāhu's Copper Plate was an important personage, for he was the daṇḍanāyāka of Rohaṇa, and if we grant that Budalnāvan of Sāhasamalla's record was a descendant of the family to which the former belonged, then it would appear that Sāhasamalla had protagonists to champion his cause, who had traditions of royal service rooted in the past.

As to the name of the place in the Coḷa country, where Sāhasamalla stayed two years until the conditions in Ceylon improved, the reading in the text is not free of doubt. Wickramasinghe gives Kahakoṅḍa, Taṅgakoṅḍa and Kaṅgakoṅḍa-paṭṭanama as possible readings, and of them the last may be taken as the nearest to the original, for

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 36, p. 225, lines 18-19.

[2] Ep. Zeyl., V, No. 1, 21-22.

Rājēndra I had the title Kangai-koṇḍa, and the place in question would have been named after that ruler.[1] The word paṭṭanama (Sinh. paṭuna) which forms the second part of the name indicates that its location was on the sea coast. The identification of this place remained uncertain. We can now be almost certain that it is the same Gaṅgaikoṇḍapaṭṭana mentioned in two South Indian inscriptions. These Tamil inscriptions at the Kakolanātha Temple on the Tirukkalakudi Hill in the Tirupattur Taluk of the Ramnad District, record a grant of land issued by a Pāṇḍyan ruler with the titles Tribhuvanacakravartin Koṇērimēlkoṇḍān (Māravarman Kulasēkhara I?) when he was encamped at Gaṅgaikoṇḍapaṭṭana. There seems to be no doubt that these Tamil inscriptions and the Sinhalese inscriptions refer to the same port.[2]

Sāhasamalla's sojourn in the Coḷa country has given rise to a belief that there was some kind of political alliance between the Coḷas and the Kaliṅgas of Ceylon, and that the Coḷa invasions of Ceylon during this period were an indirect mode of supporting the Kaliṅgas as against the Pāṇḍyas.[3] We would hesitate to subscribe to this view

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., II, 225 A. line 32: 225, note 4: p. XVI, see additions and amendments.

[2] A.R.E., Nos. 71-72 of 1916; see A.R.E. , 1916, p. 125, para.31.

[3] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br. N.S. VII, 39-40: V, 178.

as evidence in favour of it at present is too slender.

Just as Sāhasamalla ascended the throne amidst strong opposition, also the end of his reign appears to have been sudden. Even during the two years of his rule, that all was not well is hinted at in the Kevulgama Inscription attributed to this ruler, in which a grant of land is made to one of his loyal supporters named Gulpi(ṭi) But (or Gulhiṭi But Pāmbul-lē-daruvan 'for the wounds which he got in loyalty to the king from the weapons (of the king's enemies)'.[1] The record is dated in the first year of his reign and therefore this loyal personage would have been wounded either in the struggle which preceded his accession to the throne or in the first year of his reign. Thus the brief occupation of the throne would have been a difficult one for Sāhasamalla.

Sāhasamalla was deposed by the same Āyasmanta who, as we have seen, was responsible for his accession to the throne amidst great opposition.[2] Neither the Cūlavaṃsa nor the inscriptions of the period offer any clue as to why this general turned his back on the king whom he supported so actively in the beginning. The fact that Āyasmanta could raise to the throne three rulers, two of whom he deposed, shows that he was the strong man of the time - a king maker - who wished to reserve power for himself while having his nominees on the throne as

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., III, No. 23, 234-235.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 33-34.

mere figure-heads. If Sāhasamalla showed signs of asserting his authority beyond the mark, Āyasmanta would not have hesitated to put an end to his rule.

Thereafter Āyasmanta elevated Kalyāṇavatī, the first queen of Nissaṅka Malla, to the throne.[1] Though the Cūlavaṃsa refers to her as the aggamahesī, according to Nissaṅka Malla's inscriptions Kāliṅga Subhadrā was the chief queen.[2] Perhaps she became the chief queen after the death of Subhadrā. In the inscriptions of Nissaṅka Malla it is on record that Kalyāṇavatī was associated with his tulābhāras.[3] We have already referred to the Tamil invasions which seem to have taken place in her reign. The Bōpiṭiya Slab Inscription says that 'her stronghold having been broken up through the Tamil insurrection, was carried away on the shoulder'.[4] Attention has been already drawn to the Miṇipe Slab Inscription, which refers to a Tamil invasion which took place in the eigth year of her reign in which Ämati Āti, who has been rightly identified with Ābonāvan

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 33-34; Pjv., 107-108.

[2] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 17 B, 111, line 2.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., II, 111 B, lines 1-4.

[4] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 33, 192. 'Demala viyavulin kandavūra biňdī..... nä (kara) hiňduvā gena'. The word kandavūra translated by Wickramasinghe as 'stronghold' may refer to Polonnaruva as this city is also called Kaňdavuru-nuvara and Kaňdavuru-pura and Kaňdavura, Pjv., 131-32; Dal. Pjv., 59.

was destroyed.[1] In spite of these calamities which disturbed her reign, the queen and the general helped the cause of Buddhism by erecting vihāras and providing for their maintenance.[2] The pariveṇa called Rājakulavaddhana, which Āyasmanta caused to be built at Valligāma is noteworthy, and its name survives to this day as the name of a vihāra in that locality, probably at the old site.[3] Kalyāṇavatī and her general were in power for six years, quite remarkable for that period - a sufficient breathing space in which they could undertake the benevolent activities referred to in the Cūlavaṃsa.

The Cūlavaṃsa gives her a reign of six months only.[4] Both the Pūjāvaliya and the Rājāvaliya record that she ruled for six years, and we may rely on the latter.[5] The Cūlavaṃsa account of Kalyāṇavatī suggests a longer reign than a brief six months. In addition, it should be mentioned that the Miṇipe Slab Inscription refers to her eighth regnal year.[6] The eighth year, however, would correspond to the second regnal year of Dharmāsoka. Paranavitana's

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., V., No. 12, p. 158, lines 10-15; pp. 150-152.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 33-41.

[3] Cv., LXXX, 37-40; on Buddhadatta Thera's suggestion 'Sarājakulavaddhana' has been emended to 'Rājakulavaddhana' ('the furtherer of the royal family'), see Cult.Cey.Med.Times., Additions to Cv.Tr., p. 249.

[4] Cv., LXXX, 34.

[5] Pjv. 108; Rjv.Tr., 52.

[6] Ep. Zeyl., V, No. 12, p. 158, lines 10-12.

explanation of this discrepancy is that although Kalyāṇavatī was deposed, still sections of the people recognized her as the lawful ruler of the island, in preference to Āyasmanta who ruled at Polonnaruva in the name of the infant prince Dharmāsoka.[1]

The Cūlavaṃsa does not mention how the reign of Kalyāṇavatī came to an end. The narrative in the Pūjāvaliya suggests that she was deposed and a five month old infant Dharmāsoka was raised to the throne by Eḷulu Abō Senevirat (Āyasmanta).[2] The Tamil invasions which are referred to in the Miṇipe Slab Inscription could not have been the cause that led to the termination of her reign, for that event is dated in the eighth year, two years after she had ceased to occupy the throne. For some reason or other not known from any of our sources, Āyasmanta appears to have deposed queen Kalyāṇavatī and carried on the government himself through the infant prince referred to above. Dharmāśoka's reign lasted one year according to the Cūlavaṃsa, but six years according to the Rājāvaliya.[3] A six-year reign is unlikely in view of the unhappy circumstances in which he was placed on the throne and the tragedy which ultimately overtook the prince and his regent.

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., V, pp. 150-151.

[2] Pjv., 108; see also Rjv., 43.

[3] Cv., LXXX, 42., Rjv.,43.

Cūlavaṃsa mentions that one mahādipāda Anīkaṅga came with a great army from the Coḷa country, slew the ruler Dharmāśoka and the general Āyasmanta and took over the reins of government.[1] Dharmāśoka's relationship to his predecessor is not given in the Cūlavaṃsa. The Pūjāvaliya, however, gives the important detail that Dharmāsoka was Anīkaṅga's son.[2] Whether the father and son were of Kaliṅga extraction we cannot be certain, but the name Anīkaṅga was well known in the geneologies of the Eastern Gangas of Kaliṅga during this period, and it is not unlikely that they too were scions of the Kaliṅga family.[3] One other reason in favour of this supposition is that, although Āyasmanta deposed his protégeés at his will, there was some consistency in his support of the Kaliṅga princes, for both Sāhasamalla and Kalyāṇavatī, whom he deposed, were clearly of Kaliṅga origin. Hence, we may tentatively take these two princes also to be of Kaliṅga stock.

The Cūlavaṃsa refers to Anīkaṅga with the title mahādipāda which was normally given to the heir to the throne.[4] This has been taken

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 43-44.

[2] Pjv., 108, tama putu Dharmāśoka nam raja kumaruvā (his son called prince Dharmāśoka).

[3] H.C.I.P., Vol. V, pp. 205-09.

[4] Cv. LXXX, 43; Paranavitana, U.C.H.C., I, pt. I, 365-67.

with some justification to mean that he had a claim to the throne.[1] This may not be improbable, for, it may be for that reason that the latter's son was placed on the throne by Āyasmanta, having deprived his father Anīkaṅga of the opportunity of succeeding to the throne. We have seen that the personages whom Āyasmanta promoted to the throne earlier had reasonable claims to the throne, and this general seems to have had the political sagacity to see that his protégés on the throne were not upstarts. Perhaps Dharmāśoka's father had some claim to the throne, though we have no way of determining as to when he held the post of mahādipāda, or how he came to occupy that position.

Now, the Cūlavaṃsa states that Āyasmanta met his death at the hands of Anīkaṅga.[2] The Miṇipe Slab Inscription mentions that the minister Āti met his death at the hands of the Tamil forces, who landed in Ceylon in the eigth year of Queen Kalyāṇavatī.[3] The date of this Tamil invasion as given in the inscription corresponds to the time when the Cūlavaṃsa speaks of the invasion of Anīkaṅga with the Tamil forces, which also led to the murder of Āyasmanta.[4]

---

[1] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 519-20.

[2] Cv., Ch. LXXX, 43-44.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., V, No. 12, pp. 158-159.

[4] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, p. 846; Ep. Zeyl., V, 150-151.

Paranavitana is right in his opinion that both these sources - the inscription and the Chronicle - refer to the same event.[1] Ämati Äti has been identified with Äyasmanta of the Cūḷavaṃsa, and it is noteworthy that both these sources are in agreement that this general met his death at the hands of the invading Tamil forces. Thus ended in tragedy the career of general Äyasmanta, one of the most powerful generals of that period, who survived many a political storm and still dominated the political scene for nearly a decade.

It has been supposed that there was an alliance between the Coḷa rulers and the Kaliṅgas of Ceylon at the time, and that therefore Anīkaṅga was able to raise an army in the Coḷa country.[2] It is doubtful whether such an alliance existed, for, it must have been possible to collect a sufficiently large mercenary army provided they were assured adequate remuneration even without the connivance of the rulers of that country. Māgha's forces estimated at 24,000, who invaded Ceylon some time later in this period, appear to have consisted of such mercenaries, and we have no evidence to suggest that he was in alliance with any South Indian power. Even if Anīkaṅga's army was raised with the connivance of the Coḷa rulers, it achieved little

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., V, 150-152.

[2] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 520.

success, if the aim was to place Anīkaṅga on the throne. He could reign only seventeen days.[1]

Anīkaṅga was put to death by general Vikkanta-Camūnakka, who placed Parākramabāhu's queen Līlāvatī on the throne for the second time.[2] It is possible that the disappearance of the powerful general Āyasmanta from the scene had adverse repercussions on the Kaliṅga family. This general appears to have favoured the Kaliṅga princes even though he deposed his nominees on the throne at his will. The Cūlavaṃsa reveals that he was also known as Rājakulavaḍḍhana ('the furtherer of the royal family'), and a vihāra he built was so named.[3] The royal family which he supported, as known from the previous events, was the Kaliṅga family. The loss of Āyasmanta, in spite of his arbitrary behaviour towards those whom he raised to the throne, and that of a trustworthy general in Tāvurunāvan would have been a serious disadvantage to the Kaliṅga family whose very existence was now being challenged.

The rise of Līlāvatī to the throne for a second time and later for a third time, and the capture of the throne of Rājaraṭṭha by a

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 43-44.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 45-46.

[3] Cv., LXXX, 40; earlier Geiger read this name as Sarājakulavaḍḍhana, Cv.Tr., 130, note 5, but corrected it to Rājakulavaḍḍhana by accepting a suggestion from A. P. Buddhadatta, Cult.Cey.Med.Times, 249.

Pāṇḍya prince called Parākrama Pāṇḍya some time before the invasion of Māgha would show that the Pāṇḍya faction had grown in power and influence at the expense of the Kaliṅgas.[1] The Pāṇḍyas, however, could not maintain their power for long, for queen Līlāvatī was deposed by Lokissara, who came with a Damila army 'from the opposite coast'.[2] The Chronicles do not indicate the relationship of Lokissara to his predecessors. Fortunately, we have an inscription of this ruler, which informs us that he belonged to the Kaliṅga dynasty.[3] It is therefore possible that he was in some way connected with the ruling family, though this is not specifically stated.

What is significant about this epigraph is that it was set up to record a grant of land in recognition of the services rendered by Loke Arakmenā 'for the valour shown in disposing of the Coḷas for His Majesty'.[4] This statement appears strange for this monarch secured the throne with the aid of a Damily army, and what led to this conflict with the Coḷas is not clear. It has been surmised that the forces which assisted him were not a Coḷa army, on account of the

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 45-46, 49-50, 51-53;

[2] Cv., LXXX, 47-48.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., IV, No. 11, p. 87, lines 1-3.

[4] Ep. Zeyl., IV, pp. 87-88, taman-vahanseṭa Soḷīn sādhā dun daskamaṭa.

conflict with the Colas recorded in this inscription.[1] Whatever be its composition, if the army was a mercenary one, its interests might have been in conflict with those of the king one he achieved the objective of securing the throne.

The Cūlavamsa refers to Lokissara as a king 'who had been wounded in the shoulder by a spear' - a statement which also suggests that he had to face considerable opposition on his accession to the throne.[2]

Lokissara's reign was very brief. While the Cūlavamsa records a reign of nine months, the Pūjāvaliya gives him a reign of five months.[3] Lokissara was either put to death or deposed by a general named Parākrama, who belonged to the Kālanāgara family, and queen Līlāvatī was made to take over the reins of government for a third time.[4] The Dāṭhāvamsa - a history of the Tooth Relic - brings out useful details about her reign not known from the Cūlavamsa. The Dāṭhāvamsa gives the name of this general's family as Kālakanāgara.[5] The Dāṭhāvamsa Sanne (Paraphrase) gives the form Kalunnaru as its equivalent,[6] the

---

[1] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 520.

[2] Cv., LXXX,47; see also Paranavitana, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VII, 38.

[3] Cv., LXXX, 47-48; Pjv., 108.

[4] Cv., LXXX, 49-50.

[5] Dāṭhāvamsa, strophe 4.

[6] Op.cit., p. 2, strophe 4.

latter was the Sinhalese form of the name of that family then in vogue, while Kāḷanāgara was a result of the 'Palification' of that name by the Pali writers of that age. The same process has been at work in the case of Bimṭänna and Attanagalla where they were given the Pali forms Mahiyaṅga and Hatthavangalla respectively, and in the former case both the Pali and the Sinhalese forms of the name of that place have survived side by side to this day. Hence we may take Kaḷunnaru as the name of the family to which general Parākrama belonged.

The name Kaḷunnaru occurs in the list of tanks built by king Dhātusena (455-73), as contained in the Pūjāvaliya.[1] This tank is later attributed to Aggabodhi II (604-14).[2] Nicholas has noted that this name occurs in a tenth-century inscription, but gives no reference.[3] However, we get a more useful reference to some leading personages, who seem to have belonged to that family, in the Aṁbagamuva Rock Inscription of Vijayabāhu I.[4] It records the offerings which the king made to the sacred Foot Print on the Samantakūṭa, and the charitable institutions and the endowments made for the convenience of pil-

---

[1] Pjv., 99, 101.

[2] Pjv., 101.

[3] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VI, 191.

[4] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 35, p. 214, lines 51-54.

grims to the shrine there.[1] Among the four ministers of the King's Council, who carried out this order, three of them,m namely, Hakka-gam-kitu, Koḷomba-galu Dovu and Mahakiliṃgam Ki(t)ḷi-deṭu, are represented as members of the family of Mekāppara Vädārum Kaḷunnaru-bim A(yannāta)van.[2] Mekāppara vädārum of course is an official title which occurs in the inscriptions from an earlier date.[3] The general Parākrama who placed queen Līlāvatī on the throne, and who, according to the Dāṭhāvaṃsa Sanne, was a member of the Kaḷunnaru family, may be regarded as a descendent of the family to which the ministers of Vijayabāhu I who carried out the order recorded in the epigraph referred to above belonged. Therefore, we have reason to believe that Parākrama belonged to an important family, which had traditions of service to royalty in the past.

During her third term on the throne Līlāvatī reigned only seven months.[4] She and general Parākrama were deposed by a prince referred to as Paṇḍu King Parākrama, who landed in Ceylon with a Pāṇḍya army. 'Having cleared Laṅkā from the briers (of revolt)' he is said to have

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., III, 212-214.

[2] Ep. Zeyl., III, 214 B., lines 50-56.

[3] For details of these titles see Ep. Zeyl., I, 193-194.

[4] Cv., LXXX, 51.

'ruled the realm in the superb Pulatthinagara for three years, without transgressing the political precepts of Manu'.[1]

Thus the prince who deposed Līlāvatī and captured power was of Pāṇḍya stock. The Dāṭhāvaṃsa referred to above mentions a prince named Madhurinda (Madurapperumāla in the Sannaya) of the Pāṇḍya royal family who was being trained for kingship.[2] The identification of Madurinda (or Madurapperumāla) of the Dāṭhāvaṃsa with the Pāṇḍya king Parākrama of the Cūlavaṃsa is very likely. Having received the training for kingship, he perhaps thought it opportune to have the queen deposed to occupy the throne for himself. If such was the course of events, this Pāṇḍya prince may have raised an army, probably a mercenary force, to assist him in the achievement of his objective. In any case he would not have been more than an adventurer for his reign of three years which, according to the chronicler, was a beneficient one, came to a tragic end with the invasion of Rāja-raṭṭha by Māgha of Kaliṅga which took place about the year 1215.

In the survey of the events from the death of Parākramabāhu I, which we have so far made, the gradual but steady deterioration of the political situation in the island is clear. The central authority had weakened, and nearly all the rulers were deposed or slain before

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 51-54

[2] Dāṭhāvaṃsa, p. 3, strophe 7 and its paraphrase.

the normal termination of their reigns by the generals and other army officials, who appear to have been the arbiters of the political destiny of the times. We have also referred to the struggle for power which ensued between rival factions, who had their own nominees for the throne. It was when the affairs of the country were in this state of confusion that Māgha invaded Ceylon.[1] His 24,000 strong army looted, plundered and sacked Rājaraṭṭha on an unprecedented scale. The activities of Māgha require detailed examination not only for their far-reaching consequences, but because the Dambadeniya kings, Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II, had to wage a protracted struggle with this invader almost to the end of their reigns. Hence, the reign of Māgha will be taken up for a detailed examination in Chapter IV.

In our survey of the political history of the period from the death of Parakramabāhu I we have seen the gradual disintegration of the Polonnaruva kingdom until the conditions were further aggravated by the invasion of Māgha. The political conditions prevalent at the time are reflected in a passage of the Hatthavangallavihāravaṃsa describing the condition of the country on the eve of the invasion of Māgha:-

> 'When (those) many lords of Laṅka, who were like unto ornaments to (the island of) Laṅka, who were endowed with immensely meritorious and miraculous prowess, who

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 54-80.

were devoted to the Triple Gem, (had passed away) leaving but their aura of glory, and when the (other) lords of Laṅkāwho had gone astray from the path of justice, who were deficient in the customary cannons of statecraft, who (were) weaklings lacking in fortune (bhāgya), and also when the ministers of similar nature were living embroiled in mutual antagonism, then as a result of a heinous evil deed committed by the dwellers in Laṅkā in the past, the enemy forces from different regions who were ignorant of the Dispensation of the Teacher, who have entered the thicket of wrong beliefs, having arrived here from the Jambudīpa converted the whole island of Laṅkā into one of confusion and danger.'[1]

Though the description is garbed in general terms it appears to be a summary of the troubled politics of the period. The Hatthavana-vallavihāravaṃsa was composed in the reign of Parākramabāhu II, and therefore its author was removed from these events by less than about seventy-five years so that the calamities referred to would not have faded away from living memory. We have already discussed the activities of the kings 'who were deficient in the customary canons of statecraft' and also 'the ministers of similar nature who were living embroiled in mutual antagonism', and the political confusion which resulted. A Sinhalese version of the Pāli text cited above, compiled in the reign of Parākramabāhu VI adds that the kings were 'of diminished power of command' (pirihunu āṇā-bala äti).[2] That the kings of

---

[1] atha Laṅkālaṅkārabhūtesu visālapuññiddhivikkamesu ratanattayamāmakesu anekesu Laṅkānāthesu kittipuñjavasesesu jātesu apetanītimaggesu rajja-paripālanocitavidhānavirahitesu mudubhūtesu nihīnabhāgadheyyesu Laṅkis-saresu tādisakesv' eva sacivajanesu ca yebhuyyena aññamaññaviruddhesu vattamānesu Laṅkāvāsinaṃ purākatena kena pi dārunena pāpakammunā nānādesavāsino aviditasatthusamayā pavitthamicchādiṭṭhigahanā paccatthi-senā Jambudīpā idhāgamma sakala Laṅkādipaṃ anekātaṅkasaṅkulaṃ akāsi, Hvv., 31.

[2] Elu Av., 67.

this period were of less consequence is also reflected in the literary works.

An interesting passage in the Rājāvaliya goes on to explain the divisions of the kings of Ceylon into the Greater Dynasty (Mahāvamsa) and Lower Dynasty (Cūlavamsa) in these words:

> 'The Lower Dynasty is distinguished by the father or mother (of the reigning sovereign) being a descendant of the Solar line. It is designated "Lower Dynasty" because the pedigree of the sovereigns is heterogeneous, being a mixture between the descendants of those who brought the sacred Bodhi Tree and those who brought the Tooth Relic; because of the non-existence of Buddhist clergy endowed with supernatural powers; because Śakra does not protect this illustrious Laṅkā; because Anurādhapura declines for want of meritorious personages; and because the produce of agriculture is failing. The Lower Dynasty commences with the reign of Kitsirimevan, son of Mahāsēna'.[1]

It must be noted that, according to these works some of the greatest Sinhalese kings such as Vijayabāhu I and Parākramabāhu I also belonged to the Cūlavamsa. The explanation given in the passage cited above, therefore, is not justified. However, it appears that these writers record impressions of an age of decline in later times, although it has been traced back to ancient times. The reference to the decline in agriculture is particularly noteworthy. This passage, as well as that cited above from the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa, seems to bear some hints as to why the later kings were not considered equal in rank to their predecessors. A period of decline, politically as

---

[1] Rjv.Ta., 37. We have modified Gunasekard's translation slightly. Rjv.Tr., 45.

well as economically, is portrayed in them. We propose to consider that respect in the sequel.

Before we take up the invasion of Māgha for consideration it would not be irrelevant to draw attentiom to the dislocation of the administrative machinery and the decline of the economic life of the country in the period which followed the death of Parākrama-Bāhu I. Beneath the disintegration of the political unity of the country, which we have already discussed, one can also notice the tendencies towards a declining economy. The administrative machinery itself was showing signs of stress before it suffered heavily at the hands of the ruthless invader Māgha. We propose to take note of them here not only because they have a bearing on the decline and the ultimate abandonment of the Polonnaruva kingdom as well as the success with which Māgha established his power in the Rājarattha, but it also would bring into clearer perspective the circumstances in which the Dambadeni kingdom was founded, and the background to the problems with which its rulers grappled almost throughout their rule.

When one considers the heights which the political and economic power of the country attained during the reign of Parākramabāhu I, it is indeed surprising that this kingdom disintegrated and was virtually abandoned by the Sinhalese kings less than half a century after his death. Parākramabāhu not only established his authority throughout the island, but maintained his garrisons in South India and made his presence felt in that region for over a decade.[1] We have also

---

[1] See above, 106-111.

referred to his campaigns against Rāmañña, although his success in these ventures appears to have been limited. As a tank builder, Parākramabāhu stands out not only for the large number of tanks credited to him in the Culavaṃsa but also for their remarkable size.[1] Taking the archaeological remains into consideration, if Nissaṅka Malla's edifices are left out, Polonnaruva could be regarded as the city of Parākramabāhu.[2]

If this position continued well into the last quarter of the 12th century until the death of Parākramabāhu in 1186 it would be by no means an easy task to explain the speedy decline and disintegration which set in soon after his death. The chroniclers themselves seem to have found it difficult to understand the reasons for it, and were satisfied by attributing the ruthless destruction caused by Māgha to the negligence of the gods who were entrusted with the protection of Laṅka.[3]

A closer examination of the available data, however limited they may be, would make it clear that the edifice which Parākramabāhu so painfully built contained the seeds of its own decay. Soon after he disappeared from the scene, the repercussions of the policies he fol-

---

[1] C.H.J., IV, 52-68.

[2] Paranavitana, C.H.J., IV, 69-90.

[3] Cv., LXXX, 54 ff; Hvv., 31; Pjv., 108.

lowed began to have an overwhelming impact on the developments that followed.

The Culavaṃsa in its account of Parākramabāhu's immediate successor Vijayabāhu II (1186-87) makes an interesting statement:

> 'When he had received consecration as a king the prudent one in his great mercy released from their misery those dwellers in Laṅkā, whom his uncle sovereign Parakkama had thrown into prison and tortured with stripes or with fetters. By restoring at different places to various people their village or their field he increased the joyfulness of them all.'[1]

This seems to be an unhappy epilogue to the epic of Parākramabāhu and is not without significance. The only extant record of Vijayabāhu II, however, does not bear any allusion to this aspect of his reign.[2] One side of the slab in which this inscription is engraved contains further twenty-eight lines of writing, which are badly weather-worn, and therefore remain unpublished.[3] Whether the unpublished portion of this epigraph contains data to confirm the accusation made against Parākramabāhu cannot be decided. Even if it does refer to the benevolent activities of his brief reign, it is unlikely that Vijayabāhu would directly cast aspersions on his il-

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 1-3.

[2] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 30, 179-84.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., II, 179.

lustrious predecessor, for, he had taken pains to mention that he was invited to Ceylon by Parākramabāhu to take over the reins of government, the purpose of which was of course apparently to vindicate his claims to the throne of Ceylon.[1]

Geiger has observed a hiatus in the manuscripts of the Cūlavaṃsa at this point, as shown in the previous chapter, which opens with an account of Parākramabāhu's immediate successor on the throne.[2] It is noteworthy that the indirect blame attributed to Parākramabāhu in the passage cited above is in strange contrast to the tone of the preceding chapters, which extols the greatness of this ruler. We are therefore inclined to favour the view that at Chapter LXXX the narrative was resumed by some other compiler who held different oppinions from those of the chronicler who previously glorified Parākramabāhu.[3] If this is the case we have to believe that the compiler of the latter portion of the Cūlavaṃsa had not the same unstinted praise for this ruler. In any case, the passage in question is significant in so far as it throws some welcome light on a less known aspect of Parākramabāhu's reign, which had a bearing

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 30, 182-83.

[2] Cv., I, Introduction, iv.

[3] Sirima Wickramasinghe, The Age of Parākramabāhu I, Ph.D. Thesis (unpublished), 1958, University of London, Chapter I; U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 485-86.

on the developments that followed. The chronicler's charge against the latter for his excesses does notseem to be unfounded.

We have even more unmistakable evidence of the rigours to which the people were subjected by Parākramabāhu in some of the lithic records of Nissaṅka Malla (1187-96). In the Galpota Inscription it is stated that many people in Laṅkā lost their family privileges and wealth 'through the unjust acts of some kings'.[1] It is further stated that he remitted taxes for five years, and enacted a law that 'excessive taxes imposed by former kings' should not be taken, and laid down the terms on which the taxes on lands and fields were to be collected, depending on the degree of fertility in each case. The chēna cultivators 'who carried on with difficulty' were completely relieved of such taxation.[2] In spite of the propagandist style of Nissaṅka Malla's records, these statements, occurring as they do in the lithic records as well as the Cūlavaṃsa, cannot be lightly dismissed.

Parākramabāhu's military undertakings abroad, which were expected to add lustre to his crown, seem to have demanded heavy sacrifices from the people of Ceylon. His intervention in the Pāṇḍyan war

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 17, p. 110, lines 15-16.

[2] Ep. Zeyl., II, p. 110, lines 16-20; Ibid.I, N . 9, 131, lines 7-10.

of succession in particular, led to a protracted struggle spread over a period of not less than a decade.[1] The payment and maintenance of garrisons on foreign soil for so many years would have led to heavy taxation and other exactions unless they were maintained by levies in South India or lived on booty. And we have seen that though some success was achieved at the beginning, his South Indian campaigns had ended in defeat.[2] There is no evidence that these ambitious military undertakings earned for the country any political or economic benefits. On the other hand there is reason to believe that they led to a considerable drain on the human and material resources of the country even if we assume that part of the cost was met by booty. This, however, is not to suggest that these ventures led to adverse consequences which manifested themselves immediately. One must note that in spite of these costly expeditions Parākramabāhu had sufficient resources to undertake massive irrigation works and extensive building activities, which are amply testified to by the archaeological remains in Rājavaṭṭha. The repercussions of these policies were to be felt in the decades that followed his death. The measures adopted by Vijayabāhu II and Niśśaṅka Malla to relieve the suffering of the people burdened with heavy taxes, as well as the

---

[1] Cv., LXXVII; Nilakanta Sastri, C.H.J., IV, 33-51.

[2] Cv. Tr., II, 100, note 1; C.H.J., IV, 46-51.

references to those people who Parākramabāhu 'had thrown into prison and tortured with stripes', and the restoration of the villages and land of which they have been deprived, may be taken as a reflection of the exactions imposed by Parākramabāhu on his subjects.

True enough, Parākramabāhu developed the country by undertaking great irrigation projects. In Dakkhiṇadesa marshy land was cleared and rendered cultivable.[1] In Rājaraṭṭa a massive programme of irrigation works was undertaken. Similarly, he was strong enough politically as well as economically, to outdo his predecessors by resorting to conquests beyond the shores of Ceylon. His expeditions abroad, however, in the long run, seem to have added to and speeded up the decline of the Polonnaruva kingdom.

The elaborate administrative machinery which Parākramabāhu set up served him well as long as he was there at the centre to direct the affairs but, when his strong hand was no longer there, his successors were hardly equal to the task of exercising adequate control over it. The complicated irrigation system, as shown by Murphey Rhoads, presupposes a highly organised and centralised administration.[2] Once the controlling hand of Parākramabāhu was removed, the close knit fabric

---

[1] C.H.J., IV, 52-68.

[2] J.A.S., XVI, 194-95

of administration gave way and could no longer function smoothly. We have already seen the difficulties of Nissaṅka Malla in his attempts to keep his kingdom intact.[1] He was faced with the problem of keeping in check a host of officials whose allegiance was no longer a matter of course. The out-lying provinces such as Rohaṇa do not appear to have heeded the command of the king at Polonnaruva as readily as was expected of them.[2]

It is possible that excessive centralisation of the administration also produced unfortunate results. If Parākramabāhu's policy led to a weakening of the institutions of local administration, which served as useful organs through which the central authority could make its command reach the people, that again would have helped the tendencies towards disintegration. This appears to have been the course of events. Paranavitana has drawn attention to the disappearance of the princes of Dakkhiṇdesa and Rohaṇa during this period.[3] The mahayā of Dakkhiṇadesa and the äpā of Rohaṇa, appear to have had an administrative machinery, considered to have been almost a replica of central administration which functioned at the capital.[4] Paranavitana summarises the position in these words:

---

[1] See above, 122-126.

[2] C.J.S.G., II, p.23, Inscription No. 386; Muller, A.I.C., No. 152a, Ep. Zeyl., III, No. 35, 29-31.

[3] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 717, Śrī Laṅkādvīpayehi bahunāyakatvaya nokarana sē rājya sūtraya pavatvami yi sitā... Nks., 85.

[4] Ep. Zeyl., IV, No. 21, 176-180; No. 22, 180-186; No.23, 189-191; II, No. 11, 57-63; III, No. 21, 219-225.

> 'The centralisation of the administrative departments no doubt contributed towards efficiency so long as there was a strong ruler at the centre to direct affairs, and the state powerful enough to defend itself against aggression from without or to deal with internal discord. But once the strong guiding hand was removed and the capital city sacked by invaders, the administrative machinery dislocated with the loss of the archives and dispersal or death of the bureaucrats'.[1]

Once the administrative mzchinery was weakened, it would have been a very difficult task to maintain in good repair the elaborate irrigation system, which was the basis of the economy of the Sinhalese kingdom. Among the successors of Parākramabāhu on the throne of Polonnaruva, hardly any king with the possible exception of Nissaṅka Malla who probably undertook some restoration works, appears to have paid any attention to irrigation, quite apart from building new tanks on their own.[2] Once the irrigation works were neglected for want of repair, people could no longer continue agriculture with any assurance of good harvests.

It has been postulated that agriculture practised over a long period on a single-crop basis would have led to the exhaustion of the soil, which ultimately led to the abandonment of Rājaraṭṭha by its inhabitants.[3] The Rājāvaliya has a vague statement in drawing

---

[1] U.C.H.C., I, pt.II, 717.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 1-80.

[3] H.W.Codrington, JR.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VII, p.93 ff; Sorata, Introduction to his edition of Dal.S., XLV-XLVI.

a distinction between the kings of the Mahāvaṃsa and those of the Cūlavaṃsa, that one of the reasons for this division was that Anurādhapura declined for want of meritorious personages and that agriculture and horticulture was yielding less and less produce.[1] Murphey Rhoads - himself a geographer who has given thought to this problem - has shown that this supposition is unfounded.[2] No evdence has so far come to light which could warrant the assumption that a change in the climate resulted in the abandonment of Rajaraṭṭha. In these circumstances we are inclined to the belief that the decline of the irrigation system was to a large extent due to the weakening of the administrative machinery, consequent on political confusion spread over several decades, punctuated by foreign invasions which added to the confusion from time to time. The kings were hardly equal to the task of commanding the vast mass of labour and material resources required to maintain the elaborate network of irrigation schemes.[3] Estimates of the labour required made by modern engineers who have studied irrigation in Ceylon do not seem to minimise the magnitude of the task.[4] The weaklings on an ever

---

[1] Rjv., 37.

[2] J.A.S., XVI, 190-92.

[3] W.L.Strange, Report on Irrigation in Ceylon, (Colombo, 1909), p.13.

[4] R.L.Brohier, Ancient Irrigation Works, II, 37.

uncertain throne, could hardly turn their attention to irrigation. Nicholas has shown that irrigation was undertaken on a large scale, precisely during those periods when the country enjoyed comparative peace and stability.[1]

Some scholars have expressed the view that malaria also would have been one of the factors which led to the abandonment of Rājaraṭṭha. Codrington has given considerable emphasis to this factor.[2] Murphey has postulated the possibility thatsince malaria was known in the Mediterranean lands and China at a much earlier date, it would have reached Ceylon through South India in the course of time.[3] Paranavitana is not in line with this view, and his words may be quoted here:

> 'Malaria, it is true, has been very effective in preventing the re-occupation of these regions during a period of about seven centuries after their virtual abandonment in the Dambadeni period. But whether malaria was the cause or consequence of that abandonment is a debatable point'.[4]

We are inclined to favour the latter view. Codrington refers to the map of Plancius (1592 A.D.) in which an entry in Portuguese reads

---

[1] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VII, 43-64; C.H.J., IV, 52 ff.

[2] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VII, 101-102.

[3] J.A.S., XVI, 198-200.

[4] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 715.

'Kingdom of Jala deserted and depopulated for (three hundred) years by reason of unhealthiness'.[1] The identification of Jala with Yāla in the south east of Ceylon may be conceded, but it would be unsafe to rely on the figure of 300 years, which must have been based on popular tradition. Even if the figure is taken literally, it would only take us back to the end of the thirteenth century. By that time Rājaraṭṭha had long been abandoned, and a whole dynasty of rulers had ruled from Dambadeniya. Murphey Rhoads has not produced stronger arguments so that, in the absence of valid evidence, this explanation is at best a guess.

The real problem is whether malaria had taken such an endemic form at such an early date, and no evidence is forthcoming to establish the proposition that malaria was one of the factors which led to the abandonment of the Rājaraṭṭha. The Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa, which deals with the vihāra of that name and the life and reign of king Sirisaṅghabodhi (247-49 A.D.), speaks of a drought and a famine which occurred during the reign of the latter. These calamities were accompanied by the visit of a rakkhasa (demon) called Rattakkha ('red-eyed), whose very sight turned the eyes of the people red, as they were infected with jararōga (disease accompanied with fever) called rattakkhamāraka. The disease always ended in the death of the victims and the demon devoured the corpses with relish. Anyone who happened

---

[1] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br. NS. VII 102, cited by Codrington.

to see a patient who had caught this fever was also infected. It is further stated that the entire province was depopulated on account of the fear of this demon and the disease.[1] The Mahāvaṃsa refers to all these calamities which took place in the reign of Sirisaṅghabodhi, but does not make direct mention of the jararoga.[2] We would hesitate to interpret this passage as referring to malaria, although the disease if it actually spread, would have taken toll of a substantial number of human lives. Our hesitation is based on several grounds. Firstly, the events described therein refer to a time as early as the third century A.D. The Hatthavanagallavihāra-vaṃsa appears to have borrowed much of its material pertaining to the reign of this king from the Mahāvaṃsa, and the two versions agree to a very great extent, although the jararoga is not mentioned in the earlier Chronicle. Secondly, fever can be of various types, some of them infectious,at times perhaps reaching epidemic proportions. In times of drought, such as the devastating one which took place in the reign of Vaṭṭagāmaṇī Abhaya (89-77 B.C.), so vividly described in the Buddhist Commentaries, disease would naturally have taken considerable toll of human lives.[3] But it would not be possible to con-

---

[1] Hvv., 15, evaṃ nacirēn 'eva yakkhabhayena rogena ca janapado viralajano jāto.

[2] Cv., XXXVI, 73-97.

[3] Sammohavinodanī, P.T.S. ed. p. 449 ff.

clude thereby that they had a debilitating effect on the entire population, leading in turn to the decline and collapse of the medieval Sinhalese Kingdom as a whole. Thirdly, the narrative in question is garbed in myth and legend to such an extent that it would be unsafe to pick out a detail and rely on it. We can be certain that, at least until the end of the 12th century, malaria had not become a threat when we take into account the vigour of the Sinhalese kingdom distinctly seen throughout the long reign of Parākramabāhu I (1153-1186). As Paranavitana has rightly pointed out, a population living under such conditions leading to debilitation would not have been able to produce the remarkable monuments extant in Anurādhapura and Polonnaruva, or the vast irrigation projects.[1] In these circumstances we are inclined to rule out the possibility that malaria was a factor which led to the abandonment of the Rājaraṭṭha.

Returning to our survey of the decline of the economy, the debasement of the metal and the disappearance of the gold coinage during this period is noteworthy. In the last centuries of the Anurādhapura kingdom, there is evidenceto show that a considerable gold coinage was in circulation.[2] By the time of Vijayabāhu I, the metal

---

[1] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 715.

[2] H.W.Codrington, The Coins and Currency of Ancient and Medieval Ceylon, pp. 11 ff.

used was debased and the gold coinage had practically disappeared. During the reign of Parākramabāhu I and in the period that followed the metal used was virtually copper. In his study of the Coins and Currency of Ceylon, Codrington has clearly shown this marked decline of the coinage.[1] It is believed that the policies of Parākramabāhu, particularly his ambitious military undertakings abroad, led to the disappearance of the gold coinage, resulting from the drain of the country's resources.[2] Undoubtedly the maintenance of garrisons in foreign lands was an expensive item, and the mercenary soldiers had to be paid well, and the Chronicle bears ample testimony to the confusion they created when kings failed to do so.[3] But it would be unfair to blame Parākramabahu on this matter, for the debasement of the currency was already well marked in the reign of Vijayabāhu.[4] Moreover, the disappearance of the gold coinage and the general debasement of currency cannot be taken as an unmistakable sign of the decline of the economy. For it may even point to the contrary, as such a change might have taken place as a result of an expansion in the volume of trade, which made it difficult to meet the requisite

---

[1] Op.cit., p.73.

[2] U.C.H.C., Vol. I, pt. II, 551; See also Codrington, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br. NS. VII 100-101.

[3] Cv., LV, 1 ff; LXXVI, 133; XC, 12 ff.

[4] H.W. Codrington, The Coins and Currency of Ancient and Mediaeval Ceylon, 7

supplies of gold, in a country where this metal is scarce. Hence, the debasement of the coinage cannot be taken as a safe indication of a general decline in the economy.

Foreign invasions appear to have been a menacing phenomenon in the early history of Ceylon. Invaders added to the political confusion in the island from time to time. But it would be an oversimplification to attribute the collapse of the Polonnaruva kingdom to foreign invasions. No doubt, as we shall see in the sequel, Māgha appears to have been ruthless in his recourse to violence and destruction.[1] His oppressive policies forced the princes and nobles to leave Rajāraṭṭha in search of safer homes in the southern and south-western parts of the island. On the other hand, from our discussion so far it would clearly emerge that Māgha invaded Ceylon when it was beset with a tottering economy and political chaos resulting from internecine struggle for power among rival factions, and a weakened administration with diminished royal authority. In these circumstances, the quick success which Māgha achieved on invasion cannot cause much surprise. This, however, is not to suggest that Māgha's sack of Rājaraṭṭa was the sole cause of the abandonment of the Rājaraṭṭha by its rulers and the inhabitants. Rather, it was the cumulative result of the operation of several factors, each in varying degree, to which we have drawn attention in the foregoing account.

---

[1] See below, Chapter IV.

Chapter III

The Foundation of the Dambadeniya Kingdom and the Reign of Vijayabāhu III (1232-1236 A. D.)

The Cūlavamsa preserves scanty but valuable information on some of the local rulers who exercised authority in limited areas in Māyārattha and Rohaṇa while Māgha held sway in Rājarattha. In the words of the chronicler, 'during this period of alien rule several virtuous people had founded on diverse of the most inaccessible mountains a charming town (or) a village and dwelling here and there protected the laity and the Order so that they were in peace'.[1] Similarly the Hatthavangallavihāravamsa states that, being oppressed by enemy forces, the ministers and such other important personages and the people left their villages and townships in thousands in search of places of protection in the rocky mountains (giri-dugga) and forest strongholds (vanadugga).[2]

In this atmosphere of fear and uncertainty, a general (senāpati) named Subha established himself on the summit of the Subha-pabbata and 'founded a town as Vessavana the town of Ālakamandā and dwelling here and fending off the Kerala devils he protected the (surrounding) country and

---

[1] 'Tasmim rājantare keci - mahāpuññajanā bahu
tesu tesu mahāduggapabbatesu manoharam
Kāretvā nagaram gāmam - nivasantā tahim tahim
Lokam ca sāsanam cāpi pālayimsu nirākulam' Cv., LXXXI, 1-2; Geiger translates rājantara as 'alien rule' while noting that 'interregnum' is also permissible. Perhaps the latter is more suitable as the Pjv., p. 109, 130, has arājitaya, Cv. Tr., II, p. 135, note 1.

[2] Hvv., 30.

the Order'.[1] This is the first time the Pali Chronicle refers to the Subha-pabbata, which later came to be even more strongly fortified and played an important part in the military strategy employed by the rulers of this period in dealing with foreign invasions.[2] Of the Senāpati Subha nothing more is known from the Cūlavaṃsa or any other source. Perhaps he was a general who was forced to flee from Rājaraṭṭha on account of the pressure of Māgha's forces. Though there is no way of determining the precise area of his authority it does not seem to have extended much beyond the region surrounding present Yāpahuva near Māhō in the Kurunāgala District. At any rate he does not appear to have succeeded in bringing under his rule the whole or even a large part of the province of Māyāraṭṭha.

In Rohaṇa a chieftain of this type, named Bhuvanekabāhu, established himself on the rock Govindamala or Govindasela, identified with the place now known as Govindahela or 'Westminster Abbey', 'hard to reach by the rebels'.[3] Like Yāpahu, Govindahela is a prominent rock rising to a considerable elevation, located 20 miles to the west of Tirukkōvil in the Mahavādiraṭa Kōrale.[4] Such a rock even without additional fortification would have offered the kind of protection which the

---

[1] Cv., LXXXI, 3-4; Keralarakkkase for Kerala devils.

[2] Also called Sundarapabbata; now Yāpahuva; Cv., LXXXVIII, 23-26; XC, 34-35; For a general account of the remains at this site see A.S.C.A.R., 1910-11, 52-61; J. Howard, 'Notes on the fortifications of Yāpahu', J.R.A.S.Cey. Br., XIV, 1896 No. 47. For sculptures at Yāpahu, A.S.C.A.R., 1910-11, 72-76; 1911-12, 61-65; 1950, 23-24; J.R.A.S.Cey. Br., NS. VI, 95.

[3] Cv., LXXXI, 5-6.

[4] J.R.A.S.Cey. Br., NS. VI, 58.

rulers of this period sought. Nothing more is known of Bhuvanekabāhu or the family to which he belonged, but the title ādipāda, by which he is referred to in the Cūlavamsa, may suggest that he was a member of a royal family. His authority is not likely to have extended much beyond the region surrounding the rock of Govindahela from which he ruled.

The Cūlavamsa mentions one more ruler, viz. Commander (camūpati) Saṅkha, who set himself up 'on the lofty mountain Gaṅgādoṇi' in the district of Maṇimekhala. He 'gave as little heed to the infamous army of the Ruler Māgha though it was but two yojanas away as to a blade of grass and protected without fear that district and the Order'.[1] Paranavitana has indicated the possibility that Saṅkha may be identified with the general (senādhirāja) Bhāma whose achievements on the battlefield are eulogised in the Miṇipe Slab Inscription.[2] Miṇipe, the site of this record, has been rightly identified with Maṇimekhala of the Cūlavamsa, the district in which Saṅkha ruled.[3] Commenting on the two names Saṅkha and Bhāma and the apparent discrepancy of the two forms, Paranavitana has pointed out that the former does not occur in any of the manuscripts consulted by Geiger but was taken over from the previous edition of the text by Sumaṅgala and Baṭuvantuḍāve, and that the form Saṅkha is an emendation by these editors of a corruption from the original name

---

[1] Cv., LXXXI, 7-9.

[2] Ep. Zeyl., V, No. 12, 146 ff.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., V, No. 12, 154-56.

Bhāma.[1] It may be noted that Saṅkhawas also the name of a trusted general of Kittisirimegha, the ruler of Dakkiṇadesa, who was put to death on the orders of Parākramabāhu I in the early part of his career.[2] But the two names Saṅkha and Bhāma are so different from one another that it is difficult to conceive that one is a corruption of the other. Nonethe less the identification of the two personages appears reasonable, and the difficulty may be overcome to some extent if we assume that this ruler had both these names, as a result of which he figures as Saṅkha in the Chronicle and Bhāma in the epigraph.

A Tamil inscription found at Paṇḍuvasnuvara in the Girātalana Kōralē of the Dēvamādi Hatpattu in the Kuruṇāgala District is dated the fifth year of a ruler styled Tennilaṅkaik-kon-Parākramabāhu Nic-Caṅka Mallar.[3] It records the construction of certain religious edifices in Śrīpuranakara by the commander-in-chief (cenevi-nātan) Matimāṇapañcara, alias Kulaṇtey, who had amongst others the title Ilaṅkai Atikāri (Laṅkādhikāri). It has been suggested that the title Tennilaṅkai-kon may be taken as a rendering into Tamil of the title of 'the ruler of Dakkhiṇadesa' (South Ceylon). Paranavitāna is of opinion that he was a ruler of Dakkhiṇadesa but that he is not to be identified with the Kaliṅga king Niśśaṅka Mala (1187-1196 A.D.) since the latter was the ruler of the

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., V, 153-54; Cv., LXXXI, see notes to strophe 9; the manuscripts give Sabba and Pabba.

[2] Cv., LXV, 'The killing of the Sēnāpati'.

[3] U.C.R., XVIII, 157-62, text and translation, 160-62.

whole Island as is known from his inscriptions.[1]

Professor K. Kanapathi Pillai, who recently edited this inscription, has confidently identified this ruler with the Kaliṅga king Nissanka Malla referred to above, and has sought to overcome the difficulty by interpreting the obscure title as signifying 'the ruler of Laṅkā in the South'.[2] The position taken by both these scholars is not free from difficulties. One possibility which may be offered is that, at the time of recording this epigraph in his fifth year, Nissanka Malla's authority was confined to Dakkhiṇadesa. Indeed some of his inscriptions, the Kaṭugaha Galgē Inscription in particular, would suggest that there was some opposition to his rule, but this would in no way affect the overall picture presented by his numerous epigraphs found in various parts of the Island that he was the ruler of the whole country.[3] They would rule out the possibility that he suffered a political adversity of such magnitude. Even in that case, however, neither he nor his general would have admitted it in a public document such as the present one, even if in fact his authority was confined to the South of Ceylon.

The interpretation of the title as 'the ruler of Laṅkā in the South' suggested by Kanapathi Pillai may be objected to on the ground

---

[1] A.S.C.A.R., 1951, 44; A.S.C.A.R., 1951, inscription No. 19 on page 65.

[2] U.C.R., XVIII, 158-59.

[3] See above, 120-32. Ep. Zeyl., III, No. 35, 329-31.

that there is no evidence of the existence of a Laṅkā to the north of the Island. The city of Madurai, the capital of the Pāṇḍyas, is referred to as Dakkhiṇa Madhurā in the Mahāvaṃsa, evidently owing to the existence of a city of that name (Mathurā) in Northern India.[1] At this stage we may draw attention to a few South Indian inscriptions which belong to the time of Kulōttuṅga III, Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I and Jaṭāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya (accession c. 1253-54) from which we learn of the presence of Tennilaṅkai Valañjiyar - members of a trading corporation of Ceylon - in the Cola-Pāṇḍya country.[2] The phrase has been rendered to English as 'Valañjiyar of South Ceylon'. One may, however, raise the question why the traders who went to South India from Ceylon should have specified that they belonged to the South of Ceylon instead of saying that they were from Ceylon. Can the term Tennilaṅkai convey a meaning other than 'South Ceylon'? Ceylon being situated at the southernmost point of Southern India could perhaps have been referred to as 'Laṅkā in (or 'of') the South', though this is certainly not the case in every instance of the numerous references to Īḻam or Iḻaṅkai in South Indian inscriptions. Such a possibility is to some extent strenghthened by the frequent occurrence of the prefix Tennavan in the

---

[1] Mv., VII, 49; Nks., 83; Saddharmālaṃkāraya, 288, mentions Uttara Madhurā.

[2] A.R.E., No. 505 of 1922; A.R E., 1915, p. 101-02, para 32; Nos. 406-407 of 1914; No. 598 of 1926; 1926-27, pp. 92-93, para 46. Rāvaṇā is referred to as Tennilaṅkaik-kōṉ, Cuntaramūrtti Nāyaṉār Tirukkāṇāṭṭu-muḷḷur Tēvāram 147th Tiruppatikam, see Tēvāra Tirumurai, ed. Svāminātha Paṇṭitār, p. 1211.

names of persons in South Indian inscriptions, indicating that they were 'Southerners', applicable in large measure to those coming from the South of the Kāvērī.[1] The Pāṇḍya king himself had the epithet Tennavan.[2] In the light of these data, it may be tentatively suggested that the meaning of the term at times extended to include the island of Laṅkā too, situated as it is in the southernmost extremity of the mainland. Therefore we are inclined to favour the suggestion of Kanapathi Pillai that the title Tennilaṅkaik-kon referred to 'the ruler of Laṅkā in the South', while admitting however that the difficulty is by no means completely resolved. An analysis of the data in this and other relevant inscriptions would agree with this interpretation and we are inclined to favour the view that the ruler figuring in this epigraph is the Kaliṅga king Nissaṅka Malla, rather than a local ruler of South Ceylon.

First, the appellation Nissaṅka Malla Parākramabāhu is well-known among the numerous titles by which this monarch is referred to in his inscriptions.[3] This, however, does not exclude the possibility, though it seems unlikely, that a local ruler adopted the same style in his record. Second, on the basis of the astronomical data provided, the

---

[1] S.Ind. Ins., XIII, No. 330, p. 175; No. 223, p. 125; No. 100, p. 48; A.R.E., No. 27 of 1922; No. 321 of 1927.

[2] A.R.E., 1929-30, pp. 73-74; Ibid., 334 of 1929-30.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 16, p. 97, line 1; III, No. 9, p.130, lines 1-4; II, No. 20, p. 129, line 1.

nearest date arrived at has been either Thursday, 7th January 1188 or 7th January 1191. The former date agrees well with the fifth year of Nissaṅka Malla in which the epigraph is dated.[1] Here again, it is unlikely, though not impossible, that two rulers of identical titles and names ruled in Rājarattha and Dakkhiṇadesa about the same time. It may also be noted that the name Nissaṅka Malla does not occur in the inscriptions or the Chronicles with reference to any other ruler than the Kaliṅga king, with the exception of the Alakeśvara family which rose to importance in the 14th century with powerful dignitaries like Nissaṅka Alagakkonāra or Alakeśvara.[2] Third, an inscription which undoubtedly belongs to the celebrated Nissaṅka Malla dated in his ninth year has come to light in Paṇḍuvasnuvara where also the Tamil inscription in question was discovered.[3] It is inscribed on the stone throne on which Nissaṅka Malla is stated to have been seated on his return from Samanola (Samantakūṭa) and witnessed sports and theatrical performances. It also recounts the greatness and achievements of this monarch as recorded in his other inscriptions. This would lend support to the identification of the two rulers figuring in the two epigraphs, unless it

---

[1] This date has been worked out by Dr. G. S. Gai, Superintendent for Epigraphy, Arch. Surv. Ind. on the basis of the astronomical data, U.C.R., XVIII, 158, note 4; Mr. K. D. Svaminathan kindly calculated this date and arrived at the same result.

[2] Nks., 93; Sdh. Rtn., 316-17.

[3] A.S.C.A.R., 1948, 22-23.

is argued that by his ninth year Nissaṅka Malla had ousted the local ruler of Dakkhiṇadesa, who shared, as it were, not only his kingdom but also his name and title.

It is difficult to imagine that such a situation had arisen, not merely because his inscriptions state that he was the ruler of the whole island but the data contained in them dealing with his activities, as well as the accounts of his reign in the Pali and Sinhalese Chronicles, presuppose a period of vigorous activity.[1] The provenance of his records in the different parts of the island would indicate that he had a fair control of the whole country. Further they inform us that his tours included important religious centres such as Kälaṇi and Devinuvara in the South and the South-west of Ceylon.[2] He does not appear to have encountered any noticeable opposition to his rule in Dakkhiṇadesa; on the contrary he seems to have held out the people of that province and those of Rājarattha as an example to the people of Rohaṇa, who were admonished to conduct themselves in such a manner so as not to earn the rebuke of the former.[3] It is therefore difficult to imagine that Dakkhiṇadesa was outside his control during any part of his reign.

Further, the general (ceṇevi nātan) who set up the epigraph in question had amongst others the title Aivarakaṇṭan (Destroyer of the Five)

---

[1] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 508-15.

[2] Ep. Zeyl., II, 95, 119, 141; III, No. 35, 325-31.

[3] Ep. Zeyl. II, No. 35, A.p.329.

which has been interpreted as a reference to the 'Five Pāṇḍyas'.[1] This would call to one's mind the claims of Niśśaṅka Malla to have invaded the Pāṇḍya country as has been suggested by Kanapathi Pillai, but there is no strong reason to identify him with the general Lak-Vijaya-Siṅgu-Senevi-Tāvurunāvan who figures prominently in that expedition.[2] It is, however, possible that this cenevi nātaṉ also played some part in that venture.

This general is stated to have erected amongst other edifices: 'an alms-hall for the distribution of delicious food' in Śrīpurana-kara.[3] We learn from Niśśaṅka Malla's inscriptions that Śrīpura was one of the places where he established almshouses, and this suggests that he had influence in, if not actual control of, that region.[4] It is therefore not improbable that this general too contributed to the welfare of the religious establishments in Śrīpura in which his benefactor and overlord had shown interest. Or else this monarch took the credit for himself for the establishment of an institution, which in fact was largely the work of his general, for it has been found that at least a few of the monuments which he claims to have erected in

---

[1] U.C.R., XVIII, 160; see also reference to Five Pāṉya brothers in Cv., XC, 43.

[2] U.C.R., XVIII, 159-60; C.J.S.G., II, p. 199, Inscription No. 600; Ep. Zeyl., II, 151-52.

[3] U.C.R., XVIII, 161-62.

[4] Ep. Zeyl., II, 120, 178; the Alms house at Śrīpura was called Niśśaṃka Abhaya-satra, C.J.S.G., II, 186, 191, No. 550. On the identification of Srīpura see J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VI, 104.

Polonnaru were in reality the work of Parākramabāhu I.[1] His contribution in such cases was probably the repair and restoration of these edifices. In these circumstances we are inclined to favour the view that the ruler who figures in this inscription should be identified with the Kaliṅga king Nissaṅka Malla rather than with a local ruler of Dakkhiṇadesa. It would be surprising if, five years after the death of Parākramabāhu I, which corresponds to the date of this inscription, a local ruler had become so independent as to be referred to in a public document without reference to the ruler at Polonnaruva, issued from Paṇḍuvasnuvara - the very city which that ruler founded and made his base of operations in his campaigns for the unification of Ceylon. This, however, is not to ignore the forces of disintegration which set in with the death of Parākramabāhu but the data from Nissaṅka Malla's inscriptions, coupled with other considerations given above, would lead us to the inference that he was not one of the local rulers of the period in the discussion of which the present digression became necessary.

From the meagre information we have gleaned from the Chronicles, it appears that thetask before the local rulers struggling to maintain their authority in their respective areas was not an easy one. In the case of Saṅkha, or Bhāma if the epigraph cited above is attributable to him, we are told that 'the infamous army of Māgha was only two yojanas

---

[1] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 596; Cv. Tr., II, 127, note 2.

away'. Thus it would appear that the forces of Māgha had not confined themselves to Rājarattha but had also attempted to penetrate in the direction of Rohaṇa. The account of Vijayabāhu would indicate that a similar advance was made into Māyārattha.[1] The glorification of war in the Minipe Slab Inscription as pointed out by Paranavitana, though largely intended to bring out the aspect of heroism, is unusual in Sinhalese inscriptions. '(He thus) adorned the wide expanse of the earth with blood drawn out of the bodies of the enemies as if it were with a thick cluster of red lotuses, and pleased the goddess of Heroic Splendour with the play of the prowess of the arm.'[2] Though such phraseology is often met with in the eulogies of Indian kings, in the Sinhalese inscription it reflects perhaps to some extent the bitter struggle to which these chieftains were committed in order to maintain a semblance of authority in their respective areas in the face of an enemy who was more powerful than they were.[3]

If a parallel could be drawn the political situation which emerges from our data in some respects bears an analogy to that which prevailed

---

[1] Cv., LXXXI, 14-16; Pjv., 109. An inscription of the time of Parākramabāhu II states that he defeated 'the Tamils who came to destroy the Māyā kingdom', Bell, Rep. Kg. Dt., 77, lines 1-2; Paranavitana has suggested that this record could also be assigned to Parākramabāhu IV, U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 634, note 74.

[2] 'rupunāṅgin ūra gat rudhirayen tamburavanagahana se mīmaṅdulu sarahamin tamangē bāhubalalīlāyen vīraśriya satuṭukoṭā', Ep. Zeyl., V, No. 12, 159, lines 23-26, pp. 153-54, 161.

[3] It may be noted that only the Cūlavaṃsa contains a few useful details concerning these chiefs.

in the period immediately preceding the emergence of Vijayabāhu I (1055-1110 A. D.). There, too, we meet a number of chieftains - some of them princes belonging to foreign royal families who had come over to Ceylon - exercising limited authority in Rohaṇa and Māyārattha but not equal to the task of driving the Coḷa invaders out of the Island.[1] There again those rulers could not organize a common front in their struggle to expel the invader until Vijayabāhu I succeeded in rallying the people of these provinces behind him. Generals like Saṅkha endeavoured in their own way to keep the enemy at bay and give the people and the Saṃgha some degree of protection. But there is no indication that they succeeded in bringing the people under their banner in a movement of organized resistance against the invader, based on a plan of common action. Mutual antagonism appears to have been one of the factors which prevented the formation of such a united front, for in the Miṇipe Slab Inscription it is stated that Bhāma had to fight Tamil as well as Sinhalese soldiers.[2] Even the principality of Rohaṇa hardly achieved the degree of unity required for such action. We have seen the existence of at least two chieftains, Saṅkha and Ādipāda Bhuvanekabāhu, wielding authority in their respective districts, in Rohaṇa, and there may have been more of their type

---

[1] Cv., LVI, LVII; U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 418-22.

[2] 'tamanṭa yuddhayaṭa ā noek Demaḷa Simhala māra-bhaṭa puvū': 'many a Māra-like soldier Tamil as well as Sinhalese who had come to battle against him', Ep. Zeyl., V, 158-9, lines 19-21, p.161.

both in Rohaṇa and Māyārattha possibly in the group of chieftains who are termed vannirāja or vanni-niriṅdu (king of the yanni).[1] On the other hand, even if a sufficient degree of unity for collective action was achieved, it was evidently too big a task for them to overthrow the forces of Māgha, who were strongly entrenched in several strongholds in Rājarattha.[2] This is shown by the fact that Vijayabāhu III himself achieved only very limited success, and even his son Parākramabāhu had to struggle for many years before Māgha could be dislodged from Polonaruva. It has, however, been pointed out by Paranavitana that there is another possibility why the province of Rohaṇa, which in former times had been the core of resistance against foreign rule, failed to rise to the occasion in this instance: its manpower would have been greatly depleted by the ruthless suppression of the revolts there during the reign of Parākramabāhu I.[3]

It will be shown in the sequel that in the period after the foundation of Daṁbadeniya as the royal capital the province of Rohaṇa receded to the background and that the organisation of resistance to the foreign invaders centred in Māyārattha.

There is no evidence to suggest that the local rulers considered above came into direct conflict with the forces of Māgha, although they

---

[1] Cv., LXXXI, 10-11; Pjv., 109; Pärakumbā Sirita, verse 28; Girā Sandeśaya, verse 140.

[2] Pjv., 116; Cv., LXXXIII, 15-20.

[3] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 613.

felt the impact of the latter's military strength It was Vijayabāhu III who succeeded in bringing Māyārattha, which gradually became a base of resistance to foreign rule, under his control.

For the reconstruction of the reign of Vijayabāhu one has to rely to a large extent on the Pali and the Sinhalese Chronicles. No record comparable to the Panākaḍuva Copper Plate, which has shed so much light on the career of Vijayabāhu I, especially on his early life, has so far come to light.[1] In spite of the limitation of epigraphic evidence it is however possible to analyse the data contained in the Chronicles and to form a general picture of the political developments of the time.

The beginnings of Vijayabāhu are shrouded in obscurity. The Chronicles contain various traditions regarding the family to which he belonged. According to the Cūlavaṃsa he was a member of the line of king Saṃghabodhi.[2] Saṃghabodhi was a king who reigned in Anurādhapura in the third century A.D. and around him many legends depicting his great piety and generosity have grown.[3] Subsequently, on account of the great popularity and the veneration in which this monarch was held, Saṃghabodhi became a title adopted by many Sinhalese and Kaliṅga

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., V, No. 1, 1-27.

[2] Cv., LXXXI, 10.

[3] Mv., XXXVI, 58 ff; Hvv., 2 ff.

kings such as Parākramabāhu I and Nissaṅka Malla.[1] It became therefore attractive for Sinhalese kings to trace their descent back to the family of King Saṃghabodhi. The statement in the Cūlavaṃsa that the corpse of Vijayabāhu III was laid in the precincts of the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra, where King Saṃghabodhi is said to have been cremated, and that a stūpa was built over it, would suggest that such a belief about the ancestry of Vijayabāhu was current at the time.[2] The keen interest taken in that monastery by Parākramabāhu II to promote its welfare may give some confirmation to the tradition.[3]

According to the tradition recorded in the Pūjāvaliya Vijayabāhu was a direct descendant of the Saṃghabodhi family which brought the Bodhi Tree to Ceylon.[4] The same tradition is recorded in an elaborated form in the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa and its Sinhalese versions with the additional detail that Vijayabāhu's father was a royal personage (narādhipo) named Vijayamalla.[5] Sinhalese literary works such as the Daḷadāsirita, Rājaratnākaraya and the Rājāvaliya agree substantially with

---

[1] U.C.H.C., I, pt. I, 364-65; A.S.C.A.R., 1951, p. 44, No. 17; Ep. Zeyl., V, 29, 33; I, p. 223; Nks., 85.

[2] Cv., LXXXV, 73-76. The present Attanagalla, 20 miles north-east of Colombo with which this tradition is now associated was not the spot where Saṃghabodhi was cremated which, according to the Mv. Ṭīkā, p.671, lay to the south of the Issarasamana Vihāra in Anurādhapura, U.C.H.C., I, 190, note 26.

[3] Cv., LXXXVI, 37-39.

[4] '...maha bō vaḍā ā Sirisaṅgabō vaṁsayen no näsī ā Vijayabāhu nam rajjuruvō', Pjv., 109.

[5] 'tato pubbe Jayamahābodhidumindena saha sakala Jambudīpâdhipatinā dinakarakulatilakena Dhammâsokanarindena pesitānaṃ attanā samānagottānaṃ rājaputtānaṃ nattapanattādiparamparagatassa Vijayamalla-narādhipassa

(cont.)

this tradition of the descent of Vijayabāhu.[1] At first sight it may appear that the authors of the Cūlavsaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya record almost the same tradition. It is, however, possible to show that the tradition is not necessarily the same in the two works. If we rely upon the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa, which deals with the life and career of Saṃghabodhi and the history of the Hatthavanagalla Vihāra, this ruler, namely Saṃghabodhi, does not appear to have had any connection with the family which brought the Bodhi Tree to Ceylon. For we are told that the khattiya named Selābhaya who lived in Rohaṇa, fearing that his young son might be harassed by the Anurādhapura king Vohārika Tissa (209-231 A.D.), brought him to Mahiyaṅgaṇa Vihāra where he entrusted him to the assembly of monks headed by Nanda mahā thera. He sought refuge in the Saṃgha and the great Bodhi Tree for the protection of his son. Selābhaya requested the Saṃgha that his son be named Saṃghabodhi as he had sought protection in the Saṃgha and the Bodhi Tree. It is added that Saṃghabodhi was entrusted to the Saṃgha and the resident deity of the Bodhi Tree.[2] Whatever may be the truth of this story, there is no indication either in the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa or the Mahāvaṃsa account of Saṃghabodhi that he was a descendant of the family that brought the Bodhi Tree to

---

(cont.) orasaputto Vijayabāhunarindo nāma rājā', Hvv., 30; see also Mv., XIX, 1-6.

[1] Dal.S., 43; Elu. Av. (Vīdāgama), 68; Rjr., 37; Rjv., 44.

[2] Hvv., 2; Elu. Av. (Vīdāgama), 6-7.

Ceylon.[1] If such a tradition existed it is strange that the author of the Mahāvamsa, who gives considerable prominence to this ruler, fails to record it. Besides, Saṃghabodhi and his two companions, who proceeded to Rājarattha and occupied the throne there, are referred to as scions of the Lambakaṇṇa clan and not of the Moriya clan which perhaps could have claimed a link with the family connected with the bringing of the Bodhi Tree (later referred to as the Bodhāhara-kula). In the Sinhalese chronicles and literary works several other kings including Parākramabāhu VI of Kōṭṭe are associated with the latter.[2]

There are other Sinhalese works which refer to him as Vijayabāhu Vathimi raja or maharajāṇō.[3] The Daṁbadeni Asna and the Rājaratnākaraya call him Kāliṅga Vijayabāhu - a name also applied to Māgha[4] in the Nikāya Saṅgrahaya and the Saddharma Ratnākaraya. On account of this it has been suggested that some of these writers regarded him as a descendant of the Kaliṅga family.[5] It may be noted that another Kaliṅga king Sāhasa Malla (1200-1202 A.D.) had the title Sirisaṅgabo Kāliṅga Vijayabāhu as known from his inscriptions.[6]

---

[1] cf. Hvv., 2 and Mv., XXXVI, 58 ff. Both works state that they were Lambakaṇṇas; Hvv., 7.

[2] Mv., XXXVI, 58; Dal. Pjv., 59; Sdh. Rtn., 318.

[3] Ktk. Sng., 8; Nks., 88; Dal. Pjv., 64; Sdh. Rtn., 314.

[4] Dmb. A., 30; Rjr., 37; Nks., 87; Shd. Rtn., 313.

[5] U. C. H. C., I, pt. II, 614.

[6] Ep. Zeyl., II, no. 36, 224, lines 9-11; III, No. 23, 230-35.

An inscription of Parakramabāhu II at Devundara refers to this monarch as a descendant of the family (parampārava) of Somarāja of Nembara.[1] Nembara is usually identified with Nanbaṁbara, a name applied to a locality close to Daṁbadeṇiya.[2] In the Kavsilumiṇa, a poem generally attributed to Parākramabāhu II, the author claims descent from the family of Paṇḍuiṁdu.[3] The Kavsilumiṇa reference to Paṇḍuiṁdu and Saṁdakula (Candra Vaṁsa) and the statement in the Devundara Inscription taken together have led Paraṇavitana to suggest that Parākramabāhu was of Pāṇḍya stock.[4] Little credit can be given to the statement in the Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya that the father of Mahaḷu Parākramabāhu (Parākramabāhu I) was a son of Kīrtti-śrī Megha and that the latter had the title Kalikāla Sāhitya Sarvagña of Jambudroṇipura, which according to the Cūḷavaṁsa was a title of Parākramabāhu II.[5] We have already given a possible reason why such an erroneous tradition is found in this text, as there is no doubt that Parākramabahu I was a son of Māṇābharṇa.[6] It would therefore be difficult to accept the interesting suggestion of Paraṇavitana that

---

[1] A.S.C.Mem., VI, 68, lines 16-18.

[2] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 614; Daṁbadeṇi Yugaya, 14-15.

[3] Kavsilumiṇa, p. 294, verse No. 2.

[4] U.C.H.C., I pt. II, 614.

[5] Daḷ. Pjv., 59.

[6] See above, 93-94.

the confusion of the parentage of Parākramabāhu I could be attributed to the prevalence of fraternal polyandry at the medieval Sinhalese court.[1] The Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya statement can therefore hardly lead us to believe that there was any connection between the family of Parākramabāhu I and that of the Dambadeṇi kings for it has been admitted that the panegyrists of Parākramabāhu II would have taken full advantage of it if such a relationship existed.

In the above survey one is struck by the different and conflicting traditions regarding the family to which Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II belonged. Lack of unanimity on their ancestry is reflected even in the records dated in the reign of Parākramabāhu himself. For instance, while the Pūjāvaliya and the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa would have us believe that they belonged to the Saṃghabodhi family which brought the Bodhi Tree to Ceylon, the Devundara Inscription of Parākramabāhu is not only silent on such a connection but traces his ancestry to a Somarāja of Nembara. However, it is indeed strange that his own record does not state that he belonged to the Saṃghabodhi family, whereas at least two leading theras who flourished during his reign and received his generous patronage, namely the authors of the Pūjāvaliya and the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa, did so in their works. Anyhow, the tradition which appears to have gained wider acceptance as reflected in the works cited above and in several

---

[1] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 615, note 14.

others of a somewhat later date is that he belonged to the family of Saṃghabodhi connected with the bringing of the Bodhi Tree. The connection between the Dambadeni kings and the Pāṇḍyas, mentioned in some sources, has been attributed to the possibility that a Pāṇḍya lady should have been the queen of Vijayabāhu and that his son preferred to trace his ancestry to the family of his mother.[1] Although there is no positive indication of such a matrimonial link in the accounts of the reign of Vijayabāhu, this possibility cannot be ruled out, for there is evidence of the prevalence of matrilineal descent in the royal families of medieval Ceylon.[2] The literary works which contain hints of Kaliṅga affiliations are later in date than the Pūjāvaliya or the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa. It appears fairly certain that he had no direct connection with the rulers at Polonnaruva and, if he had a royal ancestry, it would have been a remote one. Paranavitana has suggested that the conflicting claims with regard to the ancestry of this royal family were either a result of the attempts made by their panegyrists to find for their patrons a respectable pedigree which they lacked, or resulted from the marriage alliances which their ancestors might have contracted with those royal families.[3] The former is more likely to have been the case with the

---

[1] S.H.C., 76; C.A.L.R., X, 43-44.

[2] C.J.S.G., II, 235-40.

[3] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 615.

Dambadeni rulers. It would have brought a measure of relief to the Samgha and the people, who had been subject to severe hardships during the oppressive rule of Māgha in Rājarattha. Consequently the writers of the period - many of them monks who benefitted greatly from his generosity - perhaps attributed to their patrons attractive royal ancestries in their poems of grateful praise. It may thus be reasonable to hold, and this in spite of the various claims made for them by the writers of the period, that Vijayabāhu III, who founded this new dynasty of rulers, had no direct connection with the Sinhalese royal houses of the preceding period. At best, if such a link connected these royal families, it would have been a remote one.

It is clear from the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya that the attainment of the position of a king of the Vanni (vannirāja) was the first important stage in the career of Vijayabāhu.[1] The term vanni occurs here for the first time in the Pali Chronicle and recurs several times thereafter in the account of Parākramabāhu II. This term has been traced to the Skt. vana (forest), though the precise etymology remains somewhat obscure. Vannirāja (Sinh. vanniniriṅdu) is regarded as a chieftain who exercised authority in a forest tract.[2] We have already examined the reference to a Colaganga in the Pāndya country, who is called a vaññō-sāmanta in the

---

[1] Cv., LXXXI, 10-11; Pjv., 109.

[2] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 737.

Upāsaka Janālaṅkāra , a feudatory of similar status.[1] There cannot be much doubt that the Pali vaññho is a rendering into that language of the Sinhalese (?) term vanni. The Nikāya Saṅgrahaya states that Parākramabāhu I brought under his control three hundred and sixty four vanni districts.[2] Parākramabāhu II had also to deal with this kind of chief and similarly Parākramabāhu VI is stated to have abolished the illegalities perpetuated by the vanni kings in their ignorance.[3] The Vīdāgama version of the Eḷuattanagaluvaṁsaya refers to vanni chieftains in connection with Sinhalese kings who ruled at Anurādhapura at a much earlier date. Goṭhābhaya (249-262 A.D.) who tried to wrest the kingdom from the pious Saṃghabodhi is stated to have set out from the northern gate of the city, collected robbers who lived in the forests and forest villages and occupied the city gate.[4] The same text refers to the vanni kings of Galval-raṭa (Malaya), who disregarded the authority of a king named Moggallāna - evidently one of the kings of that name who ruled at Anurādhapura.[5] As the Pali Chronicles make no mention of this

---

[1] See above, 133-34.

[2] Nks., 85; Dal. Pjv., 60 has the number three hundred and sixty.

[3] Pārakumbāsirita, vv.28, 46; Girāsandeśaya verse 140 states that he defeated eighteen Vanni kings; Pjv., 109, 129.

[4] '...nuvarä uturuvāsal dorin nikmä paḷamu tänä tänä Vannikälägamsoravä un sorun räskaravā senanga genä avut nuvara vāsal dora gata', Eḷu Av. (Vīdāgama), 51; cf. however, Hvv. 21.

[5] Eḷu Av., 65; cf. Hvv., p. 28, para 3.

class of chieftain prior to the reign of Vijayabāhu III it is not unlikely that the authors of these works projected a political phenomenon of their own times on to the more ancient past. It must not, however, be imagined that there were no rulers of this class in early times, but the change appears to have been that, with the decline of the central authority in the thirteenth century, their power and influence had increased so that they became a factor to reckon with in the politics of the period.

Paranavitana has drawn attention to the fact that this class of vanni kings is also known to have existed in South India, as they are mentioned in the epigraphic records there.[1] In an inscription of Cola Kulōttuṅga Cola II a Malaiyamān chieftain with the title Vanniyanāyar is mentioned, while epigraphic records of the time of Vijayanagara king Krsnarāya refer to the eighteen vanni heroes.[2] The Upāsaka Janālaṅkāra, too, would confirm the view of Paranavitana that vanni chieftains were known in South India roughly about the same period. In fact, some at least of the vanni chieftains of the period referred to in our sources were Damilas, as may be inferred from the claim of Parākramabāhu II that he subjugated the Simhala maha Vannīn (the great Sinhalese vanni chieftains) whom his father failed

---

[1] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 737.

[2] A.R.E., No. 315 of 1921; also cited by Paranavitana, Nos. 14, 19, 30 of 1926.

to conquer.[1] Unless there were Damiḷa Vanni chieftains too there is no need to describe them as Simhala maha Vannīn. Therefore it is reasonable to hold that originally a 'vanni king' was a chieftain who exercised authority in a forest tract. Later on, however, this term might have included independent or semi-independent chieftains who exercised authority in limited areas, though not necessarily in forest tracts. Such a position Vijayabāhu III reached when he attained the rank of a Vanni king.

There is no evidence to determine where Vijahabāhu's initial centre of activity was but the fact that the Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya calls him Vijayabāhu Vathimi-raja of Pūṭabhattasela or Palābatgala may be the result of a tradition which arose from his likely association with that region in his early career as suggested by Codrington.[2] Palābatgala - a mountainous locality in the Ratnapura District of the Sabaragamuva Province - situated at a distance of about 12 miles from Ratnapura on the old route to Samantakūṭa, would provide congenial surroundings to a vanni chieftain, offering protection in its rock-shelters.[3] The monastery at Palābatgala, noted for the great piety of its inmates, founded by Parākramabāhu II received the generous patronage

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIII, 10; '..piyarajahu sādhāgata nuhunu Simhala mahavannīn taman hun palama hinda sādhā', Pjv., 116.

[2] C.A.L.R., X, 43.

[3] On the original significance of the place name Palābatagala see Julius de Lanarolle, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXI, 511-12.

of this monarch.[1] We have, however, no means of ascertaining whether Vijayabāhu was associated with this region in his early career but there is no reason to discard this possibility.

Vijayabāhu gradually expanded his area of influence and ultimately became the ruler of Māyārattha. To achieve this position he had to struggle for many years, for it was evidently in his old age that he succeeded in becoming the acknowledged ruler of Māyārattha.[2] His youth was spent in this struggle during the course of which 'he had through fear of the foe withdrawn to diverse inaccessible forests and had long dwelt there'.[3] His task would not have been easy for, on the one hand, he had to withstand the impact of the forces of Māgha even though they were mainly concentrated in Rajarattha and, on the other, the local chieftains of the type considered above would naturally have jealously guarded the parochial autonomy of the districts in which they exercised authority. They would hardly have surrendered to Vijayabāhu without resistance. The Pūjāvaliya states that Vijayabāhu set out with a Sinhalese army and won over to his side the powerful Sinhalese (chieftains) who lived in the Vanni regions in

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIV, 22-24; Nks., 89, 96-98; Sdh. Rtn., 532-33 for information on the leading theras of this vihāra.

[2] Cv., LXXXI, 10-16; 'giya yovun kālayehi ma rajaya lat heyin Dravida buddha koṭa Lamkāva tanā naṭabun vehera karavā lovāda kirimaṭa kal maṅda se dāna', Pjv., 111.

[4] 'tam tam mahāvanam duggam pavisitvā'ribhītiya nivasitvā ciram Vannirājattam samupāgato', Cv., LXXXI, 11.

fear of the Damilas but were willing to accept his authority. Those unwilling to do so are said to have been subjugated.[1] It is possible that a certain amount of tact and diplomacy on the part of Vijayabāhu might have contributed to bring some of these local rulers under his influence, particularly the weaker ones, while others, as the Pūjāvaliya would have us believe, accepted his overlordship only after resistance in defence of the integrity of their territories. None of our sources mentions by name the chieftains who were thus forced to accept the overlordship of Vijayabāhu. It is unlikely that information on the activities of this ruler in his early career reached the writers who deal with his reign. This may partly explain the lack of more positive data relating to this part of his life.

On the basis of the Pūjāvaliya and the Cūlavamsa there is reason to believe that there were Tamil settlements even in the province of Māyārattha and it is stated that they had to be dislodged before Vijayabāhu could establish his authority there.[2] Though it is not explicitly stated in the Pali Chronicle the printed text of the Pūjāvaliya records that these Damilas were driven away as far as Polonnaruva.[3] There is, however, no evidence to suggest that there was a confrontation of the main forces of Māgha and those of Vijayabāhu. Though 'he had freed

---

[1] Pjv., 109.

[2] Cv., LXXXI, 14-16.

[3] Pjv., 109. This reading is however, uncertain, see Pjv., 109, note 5; Bell, Rep. Kg. Dt., 77, lines 1-2.

the Māyārattha from the briers (of the foe)' he evidently lacked the resources and the military organisation called for in such a trial of strength.

When he became the ruler of Māyārattha, he established his capital at Jambuddoṇi (Sinh. Daṁbadeṇiya) - a rocky elevation, situated 18 miles to the south west of Kurunāgala, in the Uḍukaha Basnāhira Kōrale of the Daṁbadeṇi Hatpattu in the Kurunāgala District.[1] The Sinhalese form of the name in the Pūjāvaliya still survives, but the name Dambadeṇi is now applied not only to the site of the royal city but also to a larger territorial division called the Dambadeṇi Hatpattuva. Jambuddoṇi is mentioned in the Cūlavaṁsa for the first time in connection with the reign of Vijayabāhu III.[2] Prior to that there is no indication that it ever was a seat of royal authority. The Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya and the Daṁbadeṇi Asna, both of which belong to a period later than the Pūjāvaliya and are less learned than the latter, contain vague hints of its association with Kīrtti-śri-Megha and Mānābharaṇa but they inspire little confidence.[3] It may be said with a fair degree of certainty that, judged by the data in our sources, Daṁbadeṇiya became a royal residence only with the foundation by Vija-

---

[1] Cv., LXXXI, 15-16; Pjv., 109, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VI, 105.

[2] Cv., LXXXI, 15-16.

[3] Dal. Pjv., 59; Dmb.A., 31.

yabāhu of that city. The elevation of the site gives it a commanding position, although it does not rise to bolder relief than the Yāpahu rock. Vijayabāhu's capital was situated at a distance of about 75 miles from Polonnaruva, where Māgha held sway.[1] Consequently Vijayabāhu had the advantage of being at a safe distance from the enemy.

In the selection of the site for the foundation of his capital Vijayabāhu would have given thought to its suitability as a base of operations in a future attack on the forces of Māgha in Rājaraṭṭha while, at the same time, it was less vulnerable in case the latter took the offensive. Thus Dambadeniya being a rocky elevation of the type resorted to by the rulers of the period had considerable strategic advantages. Vijayabāhu strengthened it further by the addition of fortifications consisting of walls, gate-towers and so forth.[2]

The area covered by the principality of Māyāraṭṭha, which thus became the kingdom of Vijayabāhu, has a history going back to earlier times. The occurence of Brāhmī inscriptions written in early characters indicates that this region had Aryan settlements dating back to the period when the island came to be colonised by the Aryan immigrants. In the Kāgalla and Kurunāgala Districts in particular, Brāhmī inscriptions recording donations of caves to the Saṃgha, which belong to a date

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIX, 13-14 gives the distance as five yojanas; Pjv., 138 gives twenty gavvas (visi gav), which would be about 45 miles but the actual distance is about 75 miles.

[2] Cv., LXXXI, 15-16. Later royal residences like Yāpahuva, Gampoḷa and Kōṭṭe also had strategic advantages in one way or another.

immediately preceding and following the Christian era, are found.[1] However in this early period this region of dense vegetation and heavy rainfall of the South West monsoon was less attractive to the early Aryan settlers than the plains of Rājaraṭṭha, which provided more favourable conditions for paddy cultivation.[2] In addition to disadvantages arising from heavy rainfall and thick vegetation, the terrain of Māyāraṭṭha was often interrupted by the outcrops of rocks and hills which consequently limited the available land suitable for paddy cultivation. Nicholas even hinted at the possibility that there was an exodus of the Aryan settlers from Māyāraṭṭha into Rājaraṭṭha through coersion of the kings in order to obtain the labour required for their ambitious projects in the field of irrigation.[3] There is no strong evidence to support this view, and even less reason to believe that royal coersion was involved, but the possibility that some of the early settlers migrated to Rājaraṭṭha in the hope that their lot would improve under more favourable conditions to agriculture cannot be ruled out. The coastal region of Kālaṇiya in the proximity of Colombo seems to have been an Aryan settlement of some importance, as is reflected in the Pali Chronicles, even though the account is garbed in a legendary form.[4] The discovery of early Brāhmī inscriptions in

---

[1] For an account of these regions, their settlements and inscriptions, see J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VI, 92-126.

[2] U.C.H.C., I, pt. I, 218-23.

[3] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VII, 46.

[4] Mv., I, 71-6; XXII, 13 ff.

the hinterland along the Kälani river would suggest the habitation of these areas by these settlers from an early date.[1]

With the passage of time the southern and south western parts of the island rose to importance and the Anurādhapura kings were alive to it.

Already in the sixth century Silākāla (522-535 A.D.) conferred on his second son Dāṭhāpabhuti the post of Malayarāja and was entrusted with the administration of Dakkhiṇadesa. As Geiger has observed, the implication is that this prince was entrusted with the administration of both Malayadesa (the central Hill Country) and Dakkhiṇadesa.[2] Aggabodhi I (575-608 A.D.) conferred the dignity of Malayarāja on his sister's son, while 'the province of Dakkhiṇadesa with the appropriate retinue he made over to the Yuvarāja'.[3] Thus by the ninth and tenth centuries the practice of placing the heir-apparent (Sinh. mahapā, mahayā or māyā) in charge of this southern portion of the Anurādhapura kingdom had been firmly established.[4] This region evidently came to acquire the name Māyārattha (Sinh. Māyāraṭa) in consequence of this practice.

---

[1] C.J.S.G., II, 177, 202-204, 207, 197; A.S.C.A.R., 1952, 42; U.C.R., IX, No. 1, 20, see Epigraphical and territorial map of Ceylon facing page 50.

[2] Cv., XLI, 33-35; Cv. Tr., I, 54, note 4.

[3] Cv., XLII, 6-10.

[4] U.C.H.C., I, 364-67.

Inscriptions recording the edicts issued by the princes who held this position have been discovered in Māyāraṭṭha.[1] Thus by the end of the Anurādhapura period Dakkhiṇadesa, or Māyāraṭṭha as it came to be called later, embracing wider territory in that part of the island, had acquired considerable importance in spite of the distinctly secondary position it held in relation to Rājaraṭṭha.

It was, however, with Parākramabāhu I that this region rose to greater importance. We have already discussed the establishment of his capital at Paṇḍuvasnuvara (Parākramapura) in his early career, and his contribution to the development of irrigation and agriculture based on schemes which harnessed the waters of the Dāduru Oya, and the draining of marshland and the reclamation of cultivable land in the Pañcayojana district (Pasdun Kōrale in the Kaḷutara District).[2] Parākramabāhu I thus developed the resources of this principality to a considerable extent when it became the base of operation in his campaigns for the unification of Ceylon. When he succeeded in becoming the sole ruler of the Island this region came to be directly administered from the central administration which operated from the capital city of Polonnaruva.[3] Among the successors of Parākramabāhu I,

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., IV, No. 6, pp. 50-58; No. 21, pp. 176- 80: No. 23, pp.186-9.

[2] See above, 93-96.

[3] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 531-32; note the words attributed to Parākramabāhu I in the Nks., 85; 'Srī Laṅkādvīpayehi bahunāyakatvaya nokarana sē rājya sūtraya pavatvami'yi sitā'.

Nissaṅka Malla, whose records as we have seen were found at Paṇḍuvasnuvara and elsewhere, visited in person its ancient shrines, such as those at Kälaṇiya and Devinuvara, and strove to keep this principality as an integral part of his kingdom.[1] The Cūlavaṃsa states that he laid out a fruit garden at Bhīmatittha Vihāra (now Beṃtoṭa on the western coast half-way between Colombo and Galle).[2] We cannot be certain how far the rulers that followed on the throne of Poḷonnaruva exercised effective control over the South and South West of Ceylon, but it may be noted that in the reign of queen Kalyāṇavatī (1202-1208) a vihāra named Rājakulavaḍḍhana was built at Valligāma, located 28 miles to the south of Galle on the west coast, indicating possibly that these rulers had some control over that region though not as effectively as in the time of their more powerful predecessors.[3] Thus it is clear that Māyāraṭṭha rose in importance through the centuries.

When Vijayabāhu III (1232-1236) succeeded in establishing himself as the ruler of Māyāraṭṭha, he would have taken into account the development work launched in that region by previous rulers, though much of it is likely to have fallen into decay and neglect in the

---

[1] A.S.C.A.R., 1948, 22-23: 1951, 44; See above, 121-22.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 24-25: LXXXVI 16.

[3] Cv., LXXX, 39-40; Buddhadatta has pointed out that the name of this vihāra should be Rājakulavaḍḍhana and not Sarājakula vaḍḍhana, and it has been corrected accordingly, see Cult. Cey. Med. Times, 249.

troubled period which followed the death of Parākramabāhu I. Besides, though Māyāraṭṭha lacked the advantages which Rājaraṭṭha had in so far as paddy cultivation was concerned, yet possibilities were not entirely absent. Low-lying land interlocked between hills often enabled paddy cultivation to be practised on some scale, though they had less assurance of the rich yields to which they were accustomed in Rājaraṭṭha. The chaotic political situation that followed the death of Parākramabāhu I would hardly have enabled his successors to devote much attention to irrigation or even to keeping the existing works in a state of good repair. The Chronicles hardly refer to new irrigation works built in this period, and even attempts at repair were few and far between. Nissaṅka Malla appears to have given some thought to irrigation, though it could have been little more than repair of existing works.[1] The occupation of Rājaraṭṭha by the forces of Māgha and the oppressive policies he followed would undoubtedly have led to further neglect of the irrigation works. In these circumstances, the inhabitants who migrated to Māyāraṭṭha would have naturally taken advantage of the possibilities of agriculture there, however limited they were. Apart from these, Māyāraṭṭha had important areas such as Ratnapura in the Sabaragamuva Province, well-known for gems and other precious stones.[2] We learn from the Cūlavaṃsa

---

[1] U.C.H.C., Pt.II, 513.

[2] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VI, 124-25.

that when Parākramabāhu I was the ruler of Dakkhiṇadesa he exported gems and precious stones.[1] The ports of Uruvela, Kalpiṭiya and Colombo, which later acquired great importance for foreign trade, were also within the territory of Māyāraṭṭha. It is, however, unlikely that Vijayabāhu III grasped the significance of all these possibilities, which eventually were left for his successors to take advantage of, placed as he was in such adverse circumstances. Vijayabāhu would have been more alive to the strategic and military advantages of that part of the island rather than to economic considerations. Dambadeniya, where he founded his capital, offered some of these advantages which perhaps led him to select that site.

One important factor which strengthened his position in Māyāraṭṭha was his recovery of the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl of the Buddha. At the time when Rājaraṭṭha was ravaged by the forces of Māgha, the mahātheras of the time headed by Vacīssara are said to have removed these Relics from Pulatthinagara to Māyāraṭṭha to ensure their safety. Finding that the safety of the sacred Relics was yet in danger, they are said to have buried these Relics in the earth at Kotthumala mountain and these monks crossed over to the Coḷa and Pāṇḍya countries.[2] This tradition of the monks going over to the Coḷa

[1] Cv., LXIX, 33. For an account of 'A Sinhalese Embassy to Egypt' in the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu I (1272-84) see Codrington, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XVIII, 82-85.

[2] Cv., LXXXI, 17-29; Pjv., 109.

and Pāṇḍya countries during the time of these Damiḷa invasions is also confirmed by the Upāsaka Janālaṅkāra cited earlier, whose author, as we have seen, was resident in a Buddhist monastery in the Pāṇḍya country, having gone there on account of these adversities.[1] The burial of the Tooth Relic at Kotmalē as well as its recovery by Vijayabāhu III is referred to in the Pali and Sinhalese Chronicles as well as in the works dealing with the history of the Tooth Relic. Vijayabāhu recalled these monks from South India and with their assistance recovered and removed the Relics from the spot where they remained buried to Jambuddoṇi amidst great festivity and celebrations.[2]

By this time the Tooth Relic had acquired such great veneration among the Buddhists in Ceylon that its possession seems to have become a sine qua non to justify the claims of the Sinhalese kings to the throne of Ceylon.[3] King after king made generous endowments and paid great homage to it. Kings like Vijayabāhu I, Parākramabāhu I and even Niśśaṅka Malla, if his claims are to be accepted, each built a Tooth Relic Temple, usually located close to the royal palace.[4] We

---

[1] Upāsaka Janālaṅkāra, see verses in the colophon.

[2] Dal.S., 43-44; Rjr.37-38; Rjv., 44-45; Nks. does not specifically mention the recovery of the Relics, see 87-88.

[3] Cult.Cey.Med.Times, 213-14.

[4] Cv., LX, 16: LXXIV, 198: LXXX, 19; C.H.J., IV, 80: U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 596, 599; Geiger, Cult. Ceyl. Med. Times, 213-15.

have seen that one of the reasons for Parākramabāhu's campaigns in Rohaṇa was his desire to recover the Tooth Relic which was then in that province in the possession of queen Sugalā. In the Cūlavaṃsa account of the subjugation of Rohaṇa the words attributed to Parākramabāhu I are noteworthy:

> 'Shattered in combat the foe is in flight. They have seized the splendid sacred relics of the Alms-bowl and the Tooth Relic and are fain, though fear to cross the sea. So have I heard. If this is so, then the island of Laṅkā will be desolate. For though here on the Sīhala island various jewels and pearls and the like and costly kinds of various precious stones are found, yet of quite incomparable costliness are the two sacred relics of the Lord of the truth, the Tooth and the Alms-bowl.'[1]

He arranged for a great festival for the reception of these Relics in Polonnaruva at the successful conclusion of these campaigns. The Relic was deposited in a temple built in Polonnaruva for the purpose.[2] These facts underline the importance of the Tooth Relic during this period not only in the religious life of the people but also in the political life of the country, in so far as its possession gave the ruler a distinct advantage. This is likely to have been a vital consideration especially in a struggle for power with rival claimants to the throne.

Vijayabāhu, however, did not consider it wise to follow the practice of erecting a Tooth Relic Temple in his capital Jambuddoṇi, undoubtedly owing to the element of uncertainty and the threat of

---

[1] Cv., LXXIV, 100-103.

[2] Cv., LXXIV, 198 ff.

Māgha's forces which gave an air of insecurity to the political climate of his time. He therefore constructed a Tooth Relic Temple on top of the Billasela mountain, situated at a good distance farther away from the enemy.[1] Billasela is easily identified with the present Beligala in the Ōtara Pattu in the Kāgala District in the Sabaragamuva Province.[2] Perhaps it was considered that Beligala was less vulnerable than Dambadeniya in the event of an attack by the forces of Māgha. The words of the Chronicler would best explain the political uncertainty of the time: 'In order that if in future time another interregnum occurs, no evil from alien enemies shall befall these relics of the Sage, I will carefully provide for them a still more inaccessible place fast and secure'. Thus pondering he had the Billasela (mountain) made fast on every side with walls, gate-towers and the like, that save by the gods in the air it could not be trodden by human foes'.[3] Archaeological exploration has brought to light the remains of the edifices erected by the Dambadeni kings at this site, although it has not been possible to identify the constructions of

---

[1] Cv., LXXXI, 31-39; Pjv., 109-110.

[2] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VI, 124; see Cv. Tr., p. 138, note 4. For a topographical account of this region with popular traditions on the origin of place names (not a reliable account) see manuscript British Museum Library, OR. 6607 (12) 13 Aa.

[3] Cv., LXXXI, 31-39. Same version in the Pjv., 109-10; Elu Av., 68, 'Beligala nam vū nirbhayasthānayehi'; Dal S., 44, refers to the erection of a three storeyed Tooth Relic Temple and a samghārāma.

Vijayabāhu III as distinct from those which may belong to his successors. The remains of a Tooth Relic Temple have been uncovered at this site.[1] Broadly speaking this account of the Chronicle is confirmed to a considerable extent by the archaeological remains at Beligala even though so far it cannot be determined whether the remains there belong to Vijayabāhu or to one of his successors. More intensive excavations at this site may perhaps bring to light interesting data on this subject.

The recovery of the Tooth Relic and the erection of a temple to house it was undoubtedly an important step which earned for him the support and admiration of the Saṃgha and the lay Buddhists alike. This would be even more significant for, if Vijayabāhu had no strong claim to the throne, the possession of the Tooth Relic is likely to have considerably made up for such a deficiency, justifying his position on the throne, and making him acceptable to the people as their ruler. The fact that Vijayabāhu had on his side the support of the Saṃgha headed by such leading mahātheras as Saṃgharakhita and Diṁbulāgala Araṇyavāsī Medhaṅkara would undoubtedly have gone a long way in winning the confidence of the people.[2] We learn from the Daṁbadeṇi Katkāvata and the Nikāya Saṅgraha that Saṃgharakkhita occupied

---

[1] Bell, Rep. Kg. Dt., 25-28; A.S.C.A.R., 1946, 14; for Buddhist remains from Baṭuvatta in the same region see A.S.C.A.R., 1933, J.20.

[2] Cv., LXXXI, 17 ff, 76-78; Ktk. Sng., 8

the position of Sāsanānusāsaka - Head of the Buddhist Order - and that he was the chief dignitary of the grāmavāsī sect and a pupil of Sāriputta Mahāsāmi a leading mahāthera who flourished in the reign of Parākramabāhu I.[1] Similarly, Dimbulāgala (Pali: Udumbaragiri) Medhakmara Mahāsāmi who co-operated with Vijayabāhu to effect a 'purification' of the Samgha, was evidently the head of the Vanavāsī ('forest-dwelling') sect.[2] There is little doubt that these mahātheras wielded great influence with the Buddhist population, and their co-operation and goodwill is likely to have contributed in no small measure to strengthen his position as the ruler of Māyārattha. Thus Vijayabāhu had at once the support of two important communities of monks, namely the Vanavāsī and the Grāmavāsī sects led by their respective heads. In this manner the province of Māyārattha became the refuge of the Samgha and the people of Rājarattha, who were subjected to severe hardships resulting from the oppressive rule of Māgha.

---

[1] Ktk. Sng., 8. According to the Sdh. Rtn., 313, he belonged to the Vanavāsī fraternity. Degammada Sumanajoti Thera tells us that there are many instances showing changes in the affiliations of the members of the Vanavāsī and Grāmavāsī communities, and that this could have been such a case, Dambadeni Yugaya, 164, note 1. But I suspect that the use of the word vanavāsī is simply an error in place of grāmavāsī: 'Vanavāsī vū Sāriyut māhimiyan vahansēgē śisya vū trividha śāsana nāmāti sarvaratnayan rakṣā karana samudrayak vānivū Samgharakṣita māhimiyan vahanse hā Dimbulāgala Araṇyavāsi Medhamkara mahāsthavirayan vahansē pradhānakota āti tesu gamvāsi vanavāsī mahāsamghayā vahansē', Sdh. Rtn., 313-14. Here we have evidently the names of the respective heads of the two fraternitiss. If both belonged to the same sect viz. Vanavāsī, the phrase tesu gamvāsi vanavāsi mahāsamghayāvahansē ('and other members of the Samgha of the Grāmavāsī and the Vanavāsī (fraternities) would make little sense. The fact that Sāriputta who flourished in the time of Parākramabāhu I was of the Grāmavāsī sect is well known. (cont.)

The steps taken by Vijayabāhu for the restoration of the position of Buddhism in the country by way of repairing the dilapidated monasteries, some of which are said to have suffered at the hands of the invaders, the foundation of new vihāras, his attempts at the promotion of unity in the Saṃgha by effecting a 'purification', the encouragement of the study of the Dhamma and the promotion of learning were certainly measures which earned him the unstinted admiration of the Saṃgha and the lay Buddhists, particularly at a time when they had been suffering alike under foreign rule.[1]

It would now be possible to consider the extent of the territory in which he ruled. There are indications both in the Cūlavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya that his rule was mainly confined to Māyāraṭṭha. In the former it is stated that Vijayabāhu ordered the restoration of religious edifices in Māyāraṭṭha, but no mention is made of Rājaraṭṭha which was clearly outside his control, or even of Rohaṇa.[2] Practically all the sites where he either founded new vihāras or restored the dilapidated

---

(cont.) His pupil Saṃgharakkhita might have belonged to the same sect and we may safely rely on the contemporary Daṃbadeṇi Katikāvata in preference to Saddharma Ratnākaraya written nearly two centuries later.

[2] Nks., 87-88; note that two theras by the name Medhaṅkara belonging to the Vanavāsī and the Grāmavāsī fraternities respectively participated in it, Ktk. Sng. 8.

---

[1] Cv., LXXXI, 17 ff; Pjv., 109-112.

[2] Cv., LXXXI, 62-63; Pjv., 111.

shrines, Vijayasundarārāma in Jambuddoṇi, Vattalagāma (now Vattala) and Kalyāṇi (now Kālaṇiya) located within class proximity to Colombo in the Western Province were all within the territory of Māyāraṭṭha.[1] Important vihāras in Rohaṇa such as the Mahiyaṅgana Vihāra do not figure in his programme of restoration. Such activities in Rājaraṭṭha would have been out of the question, for Māgha would not have allowed him to initiate measures to help Buddhism in his territory and win over its people to his side. In a statement attributed to Parākramabāhu II in the Cūlavamsa where the latter figures as giving paternal advice to his sons at the time of entrusting them with the administration of his kingdom, he claims that he inherited from his father the province of Māyāraṭṭha only, but that he 'brought the three kingdoms completely under one umbrella'.[2] It will be shown in the sequel that this was partly an exaggerated claim, as were many other claims made for him by the Chroniclers, but in the light of other indications referred to above, it would be reasonable to infer that Vijayabāhu's area of authority was mainly confined to Māyāraṭṭha, which thus Parākramabāhu inherited.

The Rājaratnākaraya states that Vijayabāhu 'established order in Māyāraṭa having driven out the Damiḷas into Pihiṭiraṭa' (Rājaraṭṭha).[3]

---

[1] Cv., LXXXI, 51, 58-63; Pjv., 111; Ktk. Sng., 8.

[2] Cv., LXXXVII, 24-25; 'mama piyānanvahansē maṭa genadum eka Māyā rajaya gena dān tun rajayama eksatkoṭa tabā gatimi', Pjv., 129.

[3] Rjr., 37.

This was in fact the objective of his son who for many years struggled hard to achieve it. That even in Māyāraṭṭha the element of insecurity was considerable is seen in his decision to erect the Tooth Relic Temple at Beligala and not in his capital Jambuddoṇi, for the former was 'a still more inaccessible place'.[1] The Pūlāvaliya seems to indicate that Salgalkaṅdura was a station on the frontier which separated the territories of Vijayabāhu and those of Māgha.[2] On the basis of the foregoing survey we may not be far from the truth if we infer that the rule of Vijayabāhu was in the main confined to Māyāraṭṭha.

Though such was the extent of Vijayabāhu's kingdom as reflected in the Cūlavaṃsa and the almost contemporary Pūjāvaliya the late Rājāvaliya has credited him with achievements which are beyond credence and are indeed inconsistent with the picture which emerges from the former works. It is stated:

> 'Raising a Sinhalese army, he went out and caused the forts of the Tamils in the various villages to surrender, and the forts of the Tamils at Polonnaruva to surrender; attacked, expelled and destroyed the Tamils who dwelt in the Vanni districts. Thereafter he (re)built the Thūpārāma, Ruvanvālisāya, crowned them with pinnacles and made great offerings. He cleared the jungle on the sites of the sites of the vihāras broken down by the Tamils in every part of illustrious Laṅkā.....brought Māyā and the other two countries under one canopy and received tribute.'[3]

---

[1] Cv., LXXXI, 31-37.

[2] Pjv., Note the variant reading Salagam Kaṅdavura, 111, note 14.

[3] '....Simhala senaga genagos gamagama ē ē tāna siti Demaḷa kaṅdayuru aravā vannivaḷa un Demaḷa sen kotā eḷavamin Demaḷun nasā Tūpārāmaya da Ruvanvālisāya da baṅdavā Śri Laṃkāva muḷullehi Demaḷun biṅdi vihāra eḷikaravā....Māyārata ätuluva tunraṭama eksat karavāgena ayabadu gennā vāḍa innā saṅda', Rjv., 44; Rjv. Tr., 54.

These are achievements which even his son Parākramabāhu achieved but partially and that only at the end of a protracted struggle. The exaggeration in the account of the late Rājāvaliya is too obvious to need comment and can hardly be given credit.

The length of Vijayabāhu's reign is given as four years in the Cūlavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya.[1] But the Rājāvaliya has credited him with a long reign of 24 years.[2] There is good reason to trust the Pali Chronicle and the Pūjāvaliya on this point in preference to the Rājāvaliya for a period of 24 years would be far too long if we take into account the indications contained in both these sources that Vijayabāhu ascended the throne at an advanced age 'when his youth had passed' (giya yovun kala).[3] It is stated that although Vijayabāhu cherished the desire to bring about the welfare of the world and the Śāsana, he realised that he had but a short time left to fight the Tamils in order to bring peace to Laṅkā, and to restore the dilapidated vihāras, due to the fact that he attained kingship when his youth had passed.[4] The short reign of four years is in keeping with this statement in a contemporary work and confirmed by the Cūlavaṃsa, in preference to the version given in a late Chronicle.

---

[1] Cv., LXXXI, 79; Pjv., 112.

[2] Rjv., 45.

[3] Pjv., 111.

[4] 'Mahallakatte sampatte kālasmiṃ gatayobbane
Mayā rajjasiri laddhā bhuttā c'eva tato'dhunā'.
Cv., LXXXI, 65, see also 66-67.

Geiger and Paranavitana placed the reign of Vijayabāhu III between the years 1232 and 1236 A.D.[1] According to Codrington, his rule terminated about the year 1234 A.D. as he thought that a usurper named Vathimi, who figures in a popular ballad entitled the Kalundā Paṭuna, ruled in the period between the death of Vijayabāhu and the accession of Parākramabahu II for ten years.[2] Paranavitana, however, does not give much credit to this work.[3] Codrington's view was largely based on a statement in the Daṁbadeṇi Katikāvata that Vijayabāhu III promulgated a code of disciplinary rules for the bhikkhus 36 years after the death of Parākramabāhu I, which would bring one close to the date suggested by Codrington reckoning from 1186 A.D., the date of the death of Parākramabāhu I. Paranavitana has pointed out that the Daṁbadeṇi Katikāvata does not state whether these rules were issued before or after he became the acknowledged ruler of Māyārat̤t̤ha, and he is right in suggesting that this work would indicate two sets of disciplinary rules promulgated by him - one 36 years after the death of Parākramabāhu when he was still a vanni king, and the other a more formal enactment made after his accession to the

---

[1] Cv. Tr., II, XIV, see Chronological Table; the text of the Pjv. consulted by Geiger seems to give a reign of 24 years for Viyajabāhu III, but Suravīra's edition, p. 112, has satara avuruddak (four years); Medhaṅkara edition, p.28, also gives four years. U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 846, 849.

[2] S.H.C., 76-77; C.A.L.R., X, 44-46.

[3] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 616-17.

rulership of Māyāraṭṭha with the assistance of the leading mahā-theras of the time, Saṃgharakkhita and Medhaṃkara.

There are difficulties involved in this issue on both sides. It may be noted that none of the important sources, the Cūlavaṃsa or the Pūjāvaliya contains any hint of the intervention of a usurper in the period from the death of Vijayabāhu III and the accession of Parākramabāhu II. On the contrary, the impression created is that there was a smooth transfer of power from Vijayabāhu to his son.[1] But here it must not be overlooked that such an unpalatable circumstance is not unlikely to have been even ignored by these writers who had unstinted praise for the Dambadeniya kings. Besides, one has to explain how the tradition embodied in the Kalundā Paṭuna could have arisen without even a kernel of truth. This is perhaps partly the reason why Codrington took into account this tradition though there is no doubt that the work is of a very late date which is clearly suggested by its language and the treatment of its contents.[2] There is also the additional difficulty of placing this ruler in the present chronological scheme.

Neither the Cūlavaṃsa nor the Pūjāvaliya mentions the date of the accession of Vijayabāhu or Parākramabāhu, but the Hatthavana-gallavihāravaṃsa written in the latter's reign states that Parākrama-

---

[1] Cv., LXXXI,76-80; Pjv., 111-12.

[2] For this tradition see Kāliṅga Kumārayā, Colombo, 1924.

bāhu's consecration took place 1824 years after the attainment of Enlightenment by the Buddha.[1] The Sinhalese version of this text simply states that this event took place after the lapse of 1824 years in the Buddhist era.[2] Though this dating in the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa may appear somewhat unusual there is no strong reason to distrust it, for the practice of dating events from the Enlightenment is known from the Pūjāvaliya and the Yogārṇava both written by Mayūrapāda Thera in this period.[3] But the Buddhist era is usually reckoned from the Parinirvāna and not from Enlightenment. The Sinhalese versions of the Hatthavanagallvihāravaṃsa cannot inspire greater confidence on this point, for their compilers appear to have dated the event in this manner by the omission of an important detail in the original text rather than by applying a correction of chronology based upon an important tradition.

There is no inherent difficulty in accepting the date given in the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa. It may be noted that, apart from dating events in an era in vogue, they were sometimes also dated in relation to an important event which took place earlier. For example,

---

[1] Hvv., 31.

[2] Elu Av., (Vīdāgama), 69.

[3] The Yogārṇaya, 1; Pjv. (Medhaṅkara edition), p.1. The reading in Suravīra edition, p.82, as shown in earlier chapter I is evidently wrong; [illegible].

the Mahāvaṃsa states that the Abhayagiri Vihāra was founded in the reign of Vaṭṭagāmaṇī Abhaya after the lapse of 217 years, 10 months and 10 days from the date of the foundation of the Mahāvihāra.[1] The Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa tradition on the date of Parākramabāhu's accession is confirmed by at least two other independent sources. An inscription of Parākramabāhu II at Devundara, wherein, however, the portion which refers to the date of the accession of this monarch is not in a very good state of preservation, states that this event took place on the lapse of 1779 years from the Parinirvāṇa of the Buddha.[2] Now this date agrees very well with that given in the Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa, i.e. 1824 years from the date of Enlightenment. It is well known that the period from the Enlightenment to the Parinirvāṇa is taken to be 45 years.[3] Thus the literary text in question would yield the result that the accession of Parākramabāhu took place (1824-45 = 1779) 1779 years after the Parinirvāṇa of the Buddha, and is therefore in agreement with the date given in a document issued by Parākramabāhu himself. Further, an interesting work which deals with the construction of and the endowments made to the Alutnuvara Dēvālaya states that the accession of Parākramabāhu took place after the lapse

---

[1] Mv., XXXIII, 81-82.

[2] A.S.C.Mem., VI, 68, lines 10-18.

[3] E. J. Thomas, The Life of the Buddha, ch.VI and XI.

of 1779 years from the Parinirvāṇa of the Buddha.[1] In the light of these data we may hold with a reasonable degree of certainty that the accession of Parākramabāhu II took place 1779 years after the Parinirvāṇa of the Buddha. Before we could convert this date in the Buddhavarṣa into the Christian era it would be relevant to take note of new evidence which has come to light recently and which has a bearing on the Buddhist era in Ceylon.

Until recently the earliest epigraphical document which gives a date in the Buddhist era which has been satisfactorily worked out was that of Sāhassa Malla (1200-1202).[2] Apart from this, there is the statement of Nissaṅka Malla in his Galpota Inscription that he was born after the elapse of 1700 years from the arrival of King Vijaya in Ceylon at the behest of the Buddha but the accuracy of this statement would be open to dispute in the light of another statement of his, that he effected the 'unification' of the Saṃgha in the year 1708 of the same era. Codrington suggested that the difficulty could be eliminated by assuming that the year 1700 may be taken as the date of his arrival in Ceylon and not that of his birth.[3] However, the more important epigraph is that of Sāhassa Malla where it is stated

---

[1] Sinh. Sā. Lipi., 67; here only a part of this work is published; for a complete manuscript, see British Museum Library, Or.6606, (145), 12 leaves.

[2] Ep. Zeyl., II, Nos. 36, 219, 29.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., II, 115. This implies the Buddhist era, S.H.C., 74-75.

that the consecration of this monarch took place after the lapse of 1743 years, 3 months and 27 days in the Buddhist era. Fleet worked out this date and arrived at the result that this event took place on Wednesday, 23rd August 1200, and it is regarded as a 'definitely fixed point in the later chronology' of Ceylon.[1] Fleet arrived at this result by reckoning from 544 B.C. as the initial year.

Recently Paranavitana has brought to light an inscription from Basavakkulama at Anurādhapura, on the basis of which he has tried to demonstrate that a Buddhist era reckoning from 544 B.C. was in use in Ceylon at a much earlier date, i.e. in the time of Upatissa I (368-410 A.D.), with whom the king mentioned in the epigraph has been identified.[2] According to Paranavitana the 28th regnal year of this king fell in the year 941 after the Parinirvāṇa of the Buddha. Unfortunately on the published plate of this inscription, as well as on the original, the akṣaras which refer to the Parinirvāṇa are not quite clear.[3] But the reading 941 is beyond reasonable doubt, though it is less certain whether it refers to the Parinirvāṇa. One may, however, ask, to what could it refer if not to the Parinirvāṇa? So

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., II, 220; J. B. Fleet, 'The Origin of the Buddhavarṣa, the Ceylonese Reckoning from the Death of the Buddha', J.R.A.S., (1909) 323-56; Hultzch, 'Contributions to Sinhalese Chronology', J.R.A.S., (1912), 517-31.

[2] 'New Light on the Buddhist Era in Ceylon and Early Sinhalese Chronology', U.C.R., XVIII, 192-55. This view is in agreement with his earlier views on the subject, see Ep. Zeyl., V, No. 7, 80-111.

[3] U.C.R., XVIII, text on p. 131, plate between pages 132-33.

far we do not know of an era going back to the Buddha's birth or Bodhi. In view of these circumstances we are inclined to accept the conclusions of Paranavitana on the use of the Buddhist era in Ceylon. The possible question one might raise as to why a Buddhist era in use at such an early date went out of vogue until it re-appeared at the beginning of the 13th century would present no serious difficulty. For there were instances when a particular era in use went out of vogue for a time and re-emerged at a later date as is illustrated by the Śaka era which went out of use in the period between the last Satraps (c. 480 A.D.) and the Cālukyas. There is little doubt that the record to which Paranavitana has drawn attention would prove very useful in dealing with some difficult problems relating to the chronology of Ceylon.

So far as we are concerned it is fairly certain that the Buddhist era reckoned from 544 B.C. was current in Ceylon in the thirteenth century, whatever be its antiquity. On this basis the consecration of Parākramabāhu II which, as we have seen earlier, took place in the year 1779, falls in the year 1236 A.D. Consequently, the reign of Vijayabāhu III which lasted four years would fall between 1232 and 1236 A.D. This would of course not enable us to take into account the ten years' usurpation by Vathimi, which according to Codrington's view,

intervened between the death of Vijayabāhu III and the accession of Parākramabāhu II. While appreciating the arguments of Codrington, we are inclined to favour the view of Paranavitana, partly also owing to the difficulties involved in accommodating this usurper into the chronology of this period.

Although Vijayabāhu is assigned a reign of four years in our main sources their accounts of this ruler presuppose many years of struggle and hardship before he achieved the position of the acknowledged ruler of Māyāraṭṭha evidently in old age. By the end of his reign Vijayabāhu had brought some degree of peace and order to the province of Māyāraṭṭha. Through determined effort he succeeded in organising his kingdom as a base of resistance to the invaders, who were in occupation of Rājaraṭṭha. He had taken steps to help the Saṃgha and the Śāsana and had won their sympathy and support which, in turn, would have gone a long way to strengthen the position of his son and successors. Vijayabāhu had thus cleared the background and built the foundations on which his son Parākramabāhu could continue his good work and deal with the menace of foreign invasions, which took many years of his long reign.

Chapter IV

The Treatment of the Reign of Parakramabāhu II and his Struggle with Māgha

The reconstruction of the Reign of Parakramabāhu II is beset with certain difficulties, which may be borne in mind from the beginning. Some of these difficulties arise from the nature of the treatment of this monarch in our principal sources, the Cūlavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya. These works deal at length and with great emphasis with the services he rendered to promote Buddhism. Although they provide useful information on important political events such as the foreign invasions which took place during his reign and his struggle with these invaders, there are many gaps in the narrative. The treatment is often casual and less specific than one might desire, so that it becomes difficult to attempt adequate reconstructions to bridge the gaps and make the narrative intelligible.

This difficulty is not limited to the reign of Parākramabāhu II compared with other rulers in the Chronicles but it applies in equal, if not greater measure, to this period. The inadequacy of information on some important political events of his reign is particularly striking , if one compares the Chronicle account of the reign of Parakramabāhu II with that of some of his predecessors such as Parākramabāhu I and Vijayabāhu I. In the case of Vijayabāhu, who successfully effected the expulsion of the Colas from Ceylon, it is possible to watch his early

career, his gradual emergence to the position of a powerful ruler and the strategy which ultimately led to the expulsion of the invaders and the unification of Ceylon.[1] The treatment of that ruler in the Cūlavaṃsa bears a strong annalistic character.[2] Parākramabāhu I, who is the hero of the second part of the Pali Chronicle, is treated with very great detail, with entire chapters devoted to his childhood and early career, the campaigns for the unification of Ceylon, expeditions to foreign lands and the services rendered for the welfare of Buddhism. In the case of these two rulers for whom information is available with such considerable detail there is the additional advantage that the Chronicle account can be checked to a reasonable degree with quite a large number of epigraphic records, which enable us to discount the exaggerations in the Chronicle, fill the gaps and modify the picture where necessary.[3]

The same cannot be said of the reign of Parakramabāhu II. On the one hand, as we have pointed out, the Chronicles give comparatively less information on vital political events, to which the student of history would attach greater importance than these authors have done. On the other hand, though there are a few epigraphic records, these are far less numerous and contain but limited data. Despite these

---

[1] Cv., LVII-LX.

[2] Note the statement that 'From the time that he was yuvarāja, the wise Prince (Vijayabāhu), that best of men had seventeen years chronicled in writing', Cv., LIX, 7.

[3] C.H.J., IV, 33-51, 169-81.

limitations, a careful examination of the data in the Chronicles and other sources may enable us to reconstruct the history of the reign of Parakramabāhu II to a fair degree, even though the final picture which emerges may be blurred at some points.

It is clear from both our main sources, the Cūlavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya, that these authors desired to glorify the reign of Parākramabāhu II making him the hero of their accounts. His career and deeds as well as the services rendered to Buddhism are treated in such a manner as to contribute to that objective. As a result, the events are often varnished, heroism and bravery in battle exaggerated, and more often than not these authors were silent on the reverses which, in their opinion, detracted from the greatness of their hero. A study of Parākramabāhu's reign would illustrate the validity of Geiger's observation that 'not what is said but what is left unsaid is the besetting difficulty of Sinhalese history'.[1] One redeeming feature, however, is that where such exaggeration has been made, it is often not too difficult to detect it, as may be shown in the sequel. The picture can thus be modified with the aid of internal evidence from the text and the limited data available in other sources.

The Cūlavaṃsa devotes eight chapters to the reign of Parākramabāhu II, who is the principal hero in the third part of this Chronicle, just as Parakramabāhu I occupies that position in the second part, with

---

[1] Cv. Tr., I, Introduction v.

eighteen chapters devoted to his career and achievements.[1] In all Parākramabāhu I is given 2527 strophes and Parākramabāhu II 595 in the chapters devoted to them.[1] In the older Mahāvaṃsa, out of its thirty seven chapters, eleven with 863 strophes in all are devoted to its central figure Duṭṭhagāmaṇī Abhaya.[2] Thus, the space given to the reign of Parākramabāhu II compares not unfavourably with the treatment meted out to these two heroic counterparts, who were his predecessors. In fact, none of the kings who ruled in Ceylon after Parākramabāhu I has been treated in such a manner. Parakramabāhu VI (1412-67), whose reign was important both politically and culturally, is given the major part of a single chapter of 36 verses.[3] Similarly, Kīrttisrī Rājasiṃha (1747-82), who took a keen interest in the restoration of Buddhism, is dealt with in two chapters of 483 strophes in all.[4] Parākramabāhu II thus stands out in considerable prominence as far as the treatment in the Chronicle is concerned. Compared with the information available on other important rulers of the period, in spite of the inadequacies concerning the treatment of political events, the Chronicle account of Parākramabāhu II provides a good basis for historical investigation.

---

[1] Cv., LXII-LXXIX, LXXXII-LXXXIX.

[2] Mv., XXII-XXXII.

[3] Cv., XCI, 15-36.

[4] Cv., XCIX-C.

Our sources provide little information on the early life of Parākramabāhu. This may appear somewhat strange, for in the case of Duṭṭhagāmaṇī and Parākramabāhu I, whose reigns have been glorified in heroic fashion, their birth, childhood and early life are dealt with in some detail. There the account is garbed in literary embellishment, making reference to miraculous occurrences portending their future greatness.[1] Even the name of Parākramabāhu's mother is not stated in the Chronicles or any other sources. The lack of information on his early life may be understood if one considers the stark realities of the time and the hardships which his father Vijayabāhu III experienced before attaining the position of the ruler of Māyāraṭṭha. It is possible that Parākramabāhu in his childhood was compelled by circumstances to share the hardships which his father experienced when 'he had through fear of the foe withdrawn to diverse inaccessible forests and long dwelt there'.[2] Perhaps the chroniclers felt that silence on these hardships and small beginnings of their hero was the wiser course.

If it was the desire of the chroniclers to cast Parākramabāhu II in the same heroic mould as the first king of that name, the result appears to pale before that of Parākramabāhu I. The author of these

---

[1] Mv., XXII; Cv., LXII.

[2] Cv., LXXXI, 11.

chapters of the Cūlavaṃsa was evidently a man of considerable literary accomplishment and, if the image of his hero does not come up to that of Parākramabāhu I, it may be due partly to the limitations of his sources. None the less, he worked with his material with that objective and achieved partial success.

The greatness which Parākramabāhu was destined to achieve in the future is stated to have been forecast even before his accession to the throne. In old age Vijayabāhu appears to have taken up the question of settling the succession to the throne. In order to decide which of his two sons, Parākramabāhu and Bhuvanekabāhu, was the more capable prince to succeed him after his death, Vijayabāhu consulted the opinion of those proficient in the interpretation of bodily marks (lakhaṇavedī) and it was foretold that Parākramabāhu II was destined to achieve greatness. It was found that

> 'The signs of Parākramabāhu are such that he will in accordance therewith accomplish through the majesty of his power the destruction of the enemy and will unite all Laṅkā under one umbrella so that none shall be above him; and that he will further the spotless Order of the Omniscient One; will spread his fame over the chief and intermediate regions of the heavens; will receive from most diverse countries gifts as princesses for his women's apartments and the like, and will be for long a world ruler on the Island'. [1]

Recourse to prophecy is a customary technique in dealing with kings who occupy the position of the hero - a feature not limited to the Pali

---

[1] Cv., LXXXI, 69-72.

Chronicle of Ceylon.[1] The birth of Duṭṭhagāmaṇī was prophesied through the experiences of his mother Vihāramahādevī during her pregnancy.[2] Both parents of Parākramabāhu I shared a similar experience, symbolising the birth of their great son.[3] As in the case of Parākramabāhu II, the bodily signs of Parākramabāhu I are said to have been examined by the experts in that art who foretold that the prince would in the future unite not only the whole of Laṅkā, but even rule over the whole of Jambudīpa.[4] Here we see an element common in the treatment of heroes in the Chronicles. How far Parākramabāhu II lives up to the achievements prophesied in this manner will be examined in the following pages.

In the course of time Parākramabāhu was selected to succeed to the throne. Apart from considerations of capabilities, he was also the eldest son and was therefore the rightful heir to the throne according to the customary law of succession then prevalent in Ceylon. At this stage we are told that prince Parākramabāhu was entrusted to the community of monks assembled there with Saṃgharakkhita Mahāsāmi at the head. The Cūlavaṃsa goes on to add that the same thera was entrusted with the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl as well as the com-

---

1 E.g. the prophecies concerning Gautama Buddha.

2 Mv., XXII, 42 ff.

3 Cv., LXII, 12 ff.

4 Cv., LXII, 45 ff.

munity of monks (mahāsaṃgha) and the people of the island. This passage can hardly be interpreted in a manner different from that given by Geiger.[1] It clearly conveys the sense that Saṃgharakkhita Mahāsāmi was virtually appointed the head of the Buddhist Order, but the implication that he was entrusted with the protection of the people, a non-ecclesiastical mundane function, is somewhat unusual. It does not by any means imply that the thera was in fact charged with the royal function of protecting the people, but if the Cūlavaṃsa verses are taken to convey this idea it is perhaps no more than a symbolic act. Geiger commenting on this passage says,

> 'The meaning is that the King made Saṃgharakkhita Head of the Church and entrusted him with the education of the heir to the throne. As head of the Order Saṃgharakkhita had to look after the spiritual welfare of the people over whom the King exercised secular dominion'.[2]

This is of course the most likely implication of this passage. However, the Pūjāvaliya refers to the same episode with all the details given in the Pali Chronicle, but the Sinhalese passage clearly lends itself to a somewhat different interpretation. There it is stated that having made him skilled in the various arts and sciences,

> 'having taken the elder prince (jyeṣṭha āpānan) named Parākramabāhu to the great community of monks consisting of the Grand Master Saṃgha-Rakkhita and the like, entrusted him to the community of monks

---

[1] Cv., LXXXI, 76-9.

[2] Cv.Tr., II, 142, note 1.

> and having entrusted him with (the protection of) the great community of monks, the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl, and the people, advised him to be diligent in the future in the protection of the world and the Dispensation (sāsana), and having in this manner sowed the royal seed in the field of Laṃkā, served the world and the Dispensation according to his power, ruled for four years and (passed away) leaving behind the aura of glory'.[1]

According to this reading it appears that the prince was entrusted to the Saṃgha and, in turn, the protection of the Saṃgha, Tooth Relic and Alms Bowl, and the people were entrusted to the prince. The word 'him (literally: 'them' in the plural for respect, viz. gauravārtha-bahuvacana) stands for the Sinhalese ovun and ovunṭa both referring to āpānan (Parakramabāhu) also in the gauravārtha-bahuvacana, used in the accusative and dative cases respectively. If the Pūjāvaliya version is accepted, it brings out even more clearly the close relations between the king and the Buddhist order, which undoubtedly proved beneficial to both the parties concerned. This is in keeping with what Parakramabāhu II himself did when he entrusted the administration of the kingdom to his eldest son Vijayabāhu: 'And further the King entrusted him with the five remaining

---

[1] .....noyek kalāsilpayehi Daksa karavā Parākramabāhu nam jyeṣṭha āpaṇan Saṃgharakkhita nam mahimiyan ādi vū mahāsaṃghayā karā gena gos ovun saṃghayāṭa pāvā di mahāsaṃghayā hā daḷada pātra dhatu hā rājyavāsin ovunṭa pāvā di matu lokaśāsana rakṣāvehi apramādavana se kiya mese Laṃka nāmāti kethi raja biju pihituva loka śāsanayaṭa taman balānurūpayen vāda koṭa satara avuruddak rajya koṭa kīrti-puñjāvaśeṣa kaḷaha. Pjv., 111-112.

sons of the royal house, and the two sacred relics of the holy Sage, the Tooth and the Bowl, as also with the host of the ascetics, with the group of all the dignitaries and also the land of Laṅkā.'[1] Thus the Pūjāvaliya version of this act makes better sense and is more in keeping with what is likely to have taken place, but the discrepancy in the two sources on this detail is somewhat strange, for the two accounts agree generally almost word to word. The statement in the Pūjāvaliya that the king 'advised him to be diligent in the future in the protection of the world and the Dispensation', and the reference to 'having in this manner sowed the royal seed in the field of Laṃkā' would suggest that the prince was also entrusted with a responsibility, namely the protection of the Saṃgha, the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl and the people of Laṃkā.

At a critical time in the history of Ceylon, when it was threatened with foreign invasions, the co-operation of the Saṃgha with the king would have gone a long way in winning over the allegiance of the people to his side. We learn from the Nikāya Saṅgrahaya and the Daṁbadeṇi Katikavata that Saṃgharakkhita was a pupil of Sāriputta Mahāsami who flourished in the reign of Parākramabāhu I, and he was evidently the 'Head of the Buddhist Church' at the time (tatkāla sāsanānusāsaka), and he belonged to the village dwelling (grāmavasī) community of monks.[2] He was an

---

[1] Cv., LXXXVII, 74.

[2] Ktk. Sng., 8; Nks., 87-88.

erudite monk who is credited with the authorship of several Sub-commentaries (ṭīka) and other Pali works.[1] He played a leading role in the Synod held in the Vijayasundarārāma in Jambuddoṇi with the patronage of Vijayabahu III.[2] The fact that the king had the confidence of such leading monks as the present one on his side is significant. In the past, too, Sinhalese kings had done their utmost to win the confidence of the Saṃgha resulting in 'an alliance of the Church and the State', the integrity of which no ruler could dare to violate without having to face unpleasant consequences.[3]

The young prince, we are told, was given training in all the arts and sciences (kalāsilpa). According to the Pūjāvaliya, this training included dharma-nīti (moral precepts?), raja-nīti (statecraft?), the art of letters and so forth.[4] The Daṁbadeṇi Asna elaborates on the branches of learning in which Parākramabāhu attained proficiency and states that he learnt many languages including Demaḷa, Siṃhala, Saṃskṛta and Māgadga (Pali). Similarly, the Buddha Dhamma in its three Piṭakas, Vinaya, Sutta and Abhidhamma, grammar (vyākaraṇa) in the two systems namely Moggallāyana Vyākaraṇa and Kayisan Vyākaraṇa, the three Vedas, prosody (candolakṣaṇa), astrology (nakṣatraya) and so

---

[1] Malalasekara, Pali Lit. Cey., 209, see also 186, 197.

[2] Ktk. Sng., 8.

[3] U.C.H.C., I, pt. I, 244; Ep. Zeyl., IV, No. 36, 273-85; Rāhula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, 69-77.

[4] Pjv., 111-112; Cv., LXXXI, 75.

forth are mentioned in this list. He is also said to have mastered sword-fighting (kaḍu-śilpaya), archery (dhanuśśilpaya), law (nīti-śāstraya), logic (tarkaya) and other branches of learning included in the eighteen crafts (aṣṭādaśa-śilpaya) as well as those of the sixty-four arts (sūsäṭa kalā) some of which are named in this list.[1] Daṁbadeṇi Asna should be regarded as reflecting the canons of learning and accomplishments expected of a prince according to the traditions rather than as an account of the actual attainments of the young prince Parākramabāhu. There can, however, be little doubt that, having been in the custody of a learned mahāthera such as Saṃgharakkhita for his education, he gained a high degree of proficiency in languages such as Sanskrit, Pali and Sinhalese, in the Buddha Dhamma and other branches of traditional learning. That he reached remarkable heights in this field is suggested by his upādhi 'Kalikālāḍa Sāhicca-sabbaññu-paṇḍita' (Skt. Kalikāla Sāhitya Sarvajña Paṇḍita - 'the scholar who is omniscient in the literature of the Kali Age'), which he received 'on account of his learning .[2] His scholarship and learning is brought out by the Visuddhimagga mahā sannaya and the Vanavinisa Sannaya attributed to Parākramabāhu. The former shows the profound knowledge of the author in Buddhist philosophy and other schools of thought, inaccessible to him unless he had mastered the Sanskrit language in addition to Pali,

---

[1] Dmb.A., 30-31.

[2] Cv., LXXXII, 3. It is interesting to note that this title was in use in India too in the twelfth century, see, J.B.O.R.I., XVI, 39.

while the latter speaks of his high attainments in the rules of the discipline of the Buddhist monks.[1] On the authorship of the Kavsilumina there is a difference of opinion, but the consensus of opinion is that it is a work of Parākramabāhu II.[2] If we accept this view Parākramabāhu's poetic gifts, his mastery of the canons of Sanskrit poetics and prosody gains confirmation. There are instances when the authenticity of the works credited to such scholar-kings are seriously disputed but, in the case of Parākramabāhu, there is no strong reason to doubt that he was indeed a man of great learning and the author of these works. Thus, while we concede his remarkable scholarship and learning, we cannot be so certain as to how far he mastered the canons of statecraft and the equally important science of warfare and how successfully he translated them into practice. These were, indeed, qualities called for in a prince who was to face up to the challenge of the times in which he was to take over the reins of government.

On the death of Vijayabāhu, Parākramabāhu ascended the throne and received his first consecration in Jambuddoṇi in 1236 as shown earlier. At the time of his accession Rājaraṭṭha was still occupied by Māgha who ruled from Polonnaruva. The latter is given a reign of 21 years in the

---

[1] Godakumbura, Sinh.Lit., 43-45, 20; U.C.R., I, 86-93.

[2] Godakumbura, Sinh.Lit., 148-51; Sorata assigns it to Vijayabāhu II, see Introduction to his edition of the text; Degammäda Sumanajoti Therà credits Parākramabāhu II with its authorship, Sāhityaya (1958) Dambadeni Kalāpaya, 68-73.

Cūlavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya, which implies that his regnal years were counted up to the accession of Parākramabāhu, when the latter was regarded as the lawful ruler of the island.[1] But that Māgha continued to hold sway in Rājaraṭṭha is quite clear in the Chronicles, and indeed the first task before Parākramabāhu was to deal with this invader. Considering the fact that Māgha was well entrenched in power, supported by the Kerala mercenaries, who were garrisoned in several fortified stations, the task before Parākramabāhu was evidently not an easy one.

Military preparations and strategy involving efficient planning were required to deal with this powerful enemy. Parākramabāhu appointed his younger brother Bhuvanekabāhu to the position of yuvarāja, and possibly entrusted him with the administration of a part of his kingdom.[2] The Chronicles give hardly any information on what military preparations were made; instead, their authors took pains to have us believe that Parākramabāhu was a heroic and courageous prince determined to rid the country of foreign rule. To him are attributed the words 'I will make the maiden of Laṅkā my own'.[3] The previous invasions of the country by the Damilas from the earliest times, and the manner they

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 79; Pjv., 109; gives nineteen years (ekunvisi havuruddak) but a variant reading gives ekvisi havuruddak (twenty one years) agreeing with the length of the reign given in the Cūlavaṃsa; Pjv., 109, note 1.

[2] Cv., LXXXII, 4; Pjv., 112.

[3] Cv., LXXXII, 5.

were defeated are recalled to show that Parākramabāhu was destined to play a similar role. Reference is made to the defeat of the Damiḷa invaders Sena and Guttika by Asela, and the defeat of Eḷāra by Duṭṭhagamaṇī. Similarly, other Sinhalese kings, namely Vaṭṭagāmaṇī, Dhātusena and Vijayabāhu I, who were victorious in battle against Damiḷa invaders, are mentioned.[1] We are told that Parākramabāhu was similarly determined 'to vanquish the insolent Damiḷas who have destroyed the vihāras and other buildings and also the Order of the Master and still have their abode in Paṭiṭṭhāraṭṭa'.[2]

The author of the Pūjāvaliya, as shown by Paranavitana, has even gone a step further. An obvious attempt is made to model the hero on that of the celebrated Duṭṭhagāmaṇī. In the Mahāvamsa it is stated that at the ceremony of presenting the first rice (sitthappavesamaṅgala), Kākavaṇṇa Tissa requested of his two sons Tissa and Duṭṭha Gāmaṇī to take the pledges that the two brothers would not fight each other but live in amity, that they would not turn away from the doctrines of the Buddha, or from the Saṃgha, and that they would not fight the Damiḷas. Duṭṭhagāmaṇī acceded to all requests except the last, and, angered with his father on his cowardly behaviour, he is said to have fled to Malaya and, subsequently, went to war with the Damiḷas who occupied

---

[1] Cv., LXXXII, 22ff.

[2] Cv., LXXXII, 26-27.

Rājaraṭṭha.[1] The author of the Pūjāvaliya would have us believe that Vijayabāhu acted likewise in his last days and offered them the paternal advice that they should live in amity towards each other, that as the Damiḷas were very powerful they should not resort to a Draviḍa war nor cross Salgalkaṅdura, which was evidently a station on the frontier which separated the territories of Māgha and Parākramabāhu. In addition they are said to have been admonished not to be overcome by the lust for wealth, not to resort to killing and not to embark on conquest by anger (krodha) but by compassion (maitrī).[2] From the subsequent narrative in the Pūjāvaliya, it is implied that Parākramabāhu paid no heed to his father's admonitions but was determined to make war on the Damiḷas so that 'I will not spare the damsel of Laṃkā to anyone else but make her the spouse of my own'.[3]

All this is clearly a literary exercise on the part of these authors to bring out the heroism of Parākramabāhu and requires no comment. It may, however, be mentioned in passing that the over-enthusiasm of the Pūjāvaliya author in the passage cited above would undeservedly place Vijayabāhu in the position of a cowardly figure.

---

[1] U.C.H.C., I, pt. I, 151: pt. II, 617-18; Mv. XXII, 74 ff.: XXXIV, 1-7.

[2] Pjv., 111.

[3] Pjv., 112, ...Laṃkā nämäti aṅganāva anikakhaṭa noharim maya maṭama patinī karavam maya' yi sitā.

Such an estimate would hardly do justice to this ruler who, indeed, carved out a kingdom for his son amidst great hardships. Vijayabāhu is, however, not the only ruler whose sons achieved a greater position than himself.

Prior to waging war with Māgha, one of the acts of Parākramabāhu was to bring the Tooth Relic to Beligala from Jambuddoṇi, where Vijayabāhu had placed it for greater safety.[1] A Tooth Relic Temple was erected near the royal palace, in order that he could worship the Relic 'in the three periods of the day', whenever he desired to do so.[2] We are told that Parākramabāhu held a great festival in the city in honour of the Tooth Relic, and amidst the Saṃgha, who assembled there on that occasion, took the relic on his palm and resorted to an act of faith (Skt. satyakriyā). It is stated that the island of Laṅkā was sanctified by the visits of the Buddha on three occasions and that, therefore, it was not possible for kings of a 'false faith' to hold sway there. Each of the foreign invaders was defeated by successive Sinhalese kings.[3]

Further, we are made to believe that Parākramabāhu was similarly determined to defeat the Damiḷas, who were in occupation by force. It

---

[1] Cv., LXXXII, 6-7; Pjv., 112; Dal.S., 43-44.

[2] Pjv., 112; Cv., LXXXII, 8-9; Dal.S., 44, ätuḷu rājāṅganayehi māäṅgi daḷadā geyak karavā.

[3] Cv., LXXXII, 11 ff.

is stated that Parākramabāhu claimed that if he had been chosen by the Buddha to be included among the heroic kings of old in Laṅkā, and was similarly destined to conquer the foreign enemies and establish order in Laṅkā and promote the welfare of the world and the Sāsana, the Tooth Relic should perform a miracle and demonstrate it.[1] He claimed also that in the past when the Buddha was living many far-famed monarchs heard his sermons and saw the miracles, and so did other kings like Aśoka, Devānampiya Tissa and Duṭṭhagāmaṇī, who lived when the Buddha had passed away, but had the fortune to see such miracles. Parākramabāhu wished the Tooth Relic to perform a similar miracle.[2] We are told that the Tooth Relic instantly rose to the sky and appeared in the life-like form of the Buddha, radiating the six-coloured effulgence which lit the whole city. Having satisfied the wish of the king the Tooth Relic descended and rested on the palm of the king.[3]

A whole chapter entitled 'The Exhibition of the Miracle of the Tooth Relic' in the Cūlavaṃsa is devoted to this description.[4] The Pūjāvaliya too contains essentially the same account.[5] In these

---

[1] Cv., LXXXII, 37-40; Pjv., 112-14.

[2] Pjv., 114; Cv., LXXXII, 28-40; Hvv., 31.

[3] Cv., LXXXII, 41-43; Pjv., 115; Hvv, 31.

[4] Op.cit., LXXXII.

[5] Pjv., 112-115.

accounts one can see little more than the attempt of the authors to highlight the merit and piety of the king. The statement that the Tooth Relic was brought to Dambadeṇiya from its previous repository in Beligala, and the construction of a Tooth Relic temple in that city may be accepted as a fact, for it is confirmed by several sources such as the Pūjāvaliya and the Daḷadasirita.[1] It is also possible to believe that a festival of the Tooth Relic was held soon after his accession to the throne as the symbol of sovereignty, the motive of which was perhaps not entirely religious. Considering the great veneration in which the Relic was held, popular festivals and celebrations in its honour are likely to have helped indirectly to strengthen the sympathy and allegiance of the people toward the king, particularly at a time when Buddhism had suffered considerably at the hands of foreign invaders in Rājaraṭṭha.

Before discussing the war between Parākramabāhu and Māgha, it would be appropriate to consider the basis of Māgha's power and the policy he followed. Nilakanta Sastri examined from what country he appears to have come and the nationality of the mercenary army with which he conquered Rājaraṭṭha. Māgha's army which consisted of Keraḷa Damiḷas according to the Cūḷavaṃsa, and Malalas according to the Pūjāvaliya, as shown elsewhere, has to be taken as the people of Keraḷa or Maḷa-maṇḍala (i.e. the Malabar) - names by which the

---

[1] Pjv., 112; Daḷ.S., 44.

Malabar country is referred to in South Indian inscriptions.[1] It has also shown the difficulties in accepting the view that Māgha and his army were Malays. The strength of Māgha's invading army, given as 24,000 (Rjv. 20,000), could well be a round number, but there is little doubt that Māgha was assisted by a powerful army, without which he could not possibly have continued to be in power for so long a period.[2]

The fortifications of Māgha and his ally Jayabāhu were located in Pulatthipura (Polonnaruva), Kottasārakagāma (Kotasara), Gaṅgātaḷāka (Gaṅgatalā), Kākāhaṭagāma (Kavudāvulu), Padīratṭha (Padī), Kurundi (Kurundu), Mānāmatta (Mānāmatu), Mahātittha (Māvaṭu), Mannāra (Mannāra), Pulacceritittha (Pulucceri), Vālikagāma (Väligamu), Gonarattha (Gona), Gonusuratṭha (Govusu ?), Madhupādapatittha (Mīpātoṭa), Sūkaratittha (Hūrātoṭa).[3] The Pūjāvaliya contains much the same list except for the addition of a place named Debarapaṭan.[4] Codrington and Nicholas have identified many of these places, some without any

---

[1] Geiger renders Damiḷakeraḷā of Cv., LXXXIII, 20 as 'Damiḷas and Keraḷas', Cv. Tr., II, p.150; and Coḷiyadāmiḷe of LXXXII, 25 as 'Coḷiyas and Damiḷas', Cv.Tr., II, p. 145. The Pūjāvaliya 113 in its narrative of the same events has the form Soḷī Demaḷun which means Cōḷa Damiḷas and not Damiḷas and Coḷas. The form Soḷī Demaḷun is also mentioned in medieval Sinhalese inscriptions, Ep. Zeyl., V, No. 1, p. 21, line 2. On this analogy, Damiḷakeraḷā should also be rendered as Kerala Damiḷas.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 58-59; Pjv., 108; Rjv., 44. The Sinhalese forms found in the Pūjāvaliya are given in brackets.

[3] Cv., LXXXIII, 15-18; Nks., 88 adds a place named Maṇḍali.

[4] Pjv., 116. A.R.E., No. 77 of 1936-37: 1931-32, p. 59: Nos. 15-16 of 1935-36.

difficulty. Of these fortifications practically all were coastal stations and others too were located not far from the north western and north eastern coasts, Mannāra (Mannar), Māvaṭu (Māntai), Mānāmatta and possibly Mīpāṭoṭa were ports in that area, while Gaṅgatalā (Kantalai), Koṭasara (Koṭṭiyār) and Gona (Trincomalee) were located in the latter. Hūrāṭoṭa is identified with Kayts in the extreme north of Ceylon.[1] All these fortifications where garrisons were maintained were located in Rājaraṭṭha.

The concentration of his forces in the region of the ports of Mahātittha in the north west, Trincomalee in the north east, and Kayts in the north may imply that he expected a threat to his authority from outside Ceylon, and from a consideration of the events which followed it would be clare that this fear was not unfounded. It is also significant that in this list of fortifications hardly any was located in what may be regarded as the frontier separating the realms of Māgha and Parākramabāhu. This list, however, may not cover all his strongholds, as the Cūlavaṃsa says that they were located 'at these and other places'.[2] It is, however, fairly clear that great attention was paid to strengthen and fortify the coastal points where an invading army could land, as indeed they had done in the past.[3] If

---

[1] Nicholas, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. Special Number, 33-35, 45-46, 85-87; 81, 75-79, 44, 84; C.A.L.R., X, 93ff; Medhaṅkara Thera is inclined to locate Gona in the north-western sea coast, see his edition of the Pjv., Chapter 34, p.71; see,however, Ep. Zeyl, V, 171-72.

(cont.)

this list of fortifications is a fair indication, it may be suggested that Māgha did not take a possible challenge to his authority from the ruler of Māyārattha very seriously. The Pūjāvaliya states that the forces of the two Damila kings Māgha and Jayabāhu were in occupation of those regions for forty years.[1] The Cūlavamsa states that they were in occupation for a long time (cirakālmniOvāsinam). Thus Māgha's rule in Rājarattha was evidently longer than the 21 year reign assigned to him in the Cūlavamsa, and it certainly extended into the reign of Parākramabāhu, although the reckoning of his regnal years apparently ceased with the accession of Parākramabāhu. As we have shown elsewhere, during this long period, there is no indication that Māgha's authority was effectively challenged at any time, although there were local rulers in Rohaṇa and Māyārattha who succeeded in maintaining their authority in limited areas. At least we have no indication in any of our principal sources that Māgha was prepared for an invasion from Māyārattha or Rohaṇa. Māgha perhaps concentrated his garrisons in the coastal areas of the north west and the north east in view of the remoteness of an attack by the people of Māyārattha and Rohaṇa.

(cont.)

[2] Cv., LXXXIII, 18.

[3] Mahātittha and Sūkaratittha in particular were ports where invaders landed in the past, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. Special Number, 75-79, 84,(1959).

---

1 Pjv., 116.

As soon as Māgha succeeded in occupying the northern parts of Ceylon with his Kerala mercenaries he set himself up as the ruler, with Polonnaruva as his capital. We are told that Māgha's soldiers captured Parākrama Pāndya, the king ruling in Polonnaruva at the time of the invasion, put his eyes out and seized all his treasure. Then the narrative goes on to state that 'the leaders of the soldiers with Māṇābharaṇa at the head, consecrated the Kāliṅga Māgha to the royal dignity of Laṅkā'.[1] This Māṇābharaṇa, who appears to have been a chief general in the forces of Māgha, is not mentioned in any other source. Even in the Cūlavaṃsa he figures only in the account of the consecration of Māgha, but is nowhere referred to again.

In the absence of any clue to his identification, we may suggest one of two possibilities. Mānābharaṇa was perhaps a Sinhalese general, who was himself a party to the factional feuds which were rampant in the politics of Polonnaruva during this period, who took the side of the invader. There were precedents when certain Sinhalese nobles and army leaders took the side of the invader or crossed over to the enemy camp during the course of the wars.[2] In favour of this possibility, it can also be added that if Mānā-

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 71-73.

[2] Cv., LXXXVIII, 38-40; LVIII, 16-17, 33-37.

bharaṇa was such a personage, Māgha would probably have considered him a person suitable to be chiefly instrumental in his consecration, for, it would have brought in a semblance of approval in the eyes of the people. However, it has to be noted that in the political history of this period, where numerous generals who engaged in the factional disputes are mentioned, no military personage of consequence by the name of Mānābharaṇa figures in any of our sources. Another possibility is that he was a Damiḷa himself, a leader of the mercenary army of Keraḷas, with which Māgha invaded Ceylon. The name Mānābharaṇa is sometimes met with in South Indian inscriptions of this period. In an inscription of Rājādhirāja Coḷa, successor of Rājendra I, three Pāṇḍya kings viz. Mānābharaṇa, Vīra Keraḷa Pāṇḍya and Sundara Pāṇḍya are mentioned among his enemies.[1] Similarly, in an inscription of Jaṭavarman Vīra Pāṇḍya (acc. c. 1253) a Mānābharaṇa Bhaṭṭa who was evidently some important official figures as a signatory in a transaction.[2] In Ceylon, too, the princes who had the name Mānābharaṇa had Pāṇḍya affiliations on their paternal side. Of these princes, the best known is the father of Parākramabāhu I. The latter's father had a brother named Siri Vallabha, the ruler of Rohaṇa, whose son was again a Mānābharaṇa. Both these princes were of Pāṇḍyan stock on the father's side, for they were descendants

---

[1] A.R.E., 1892, p.5; S.Ind.Ins., III, 56; see also 1898, pp.1-2.

[2] A.R.E., No.339 Of 1916.

of a Pāṇḍya prince to whom Vijayabāhu I had given his sister in marriage.[1] If this was more than a coincidence it may not be improbable that Mānābharaṇa who consecrated Māgha was himself a South Indian who belonged to the invading army. However, it would be unsafe to press this possibility too far, for a name is not always a safe indication of the territory and race to which a person belonged.

Apart from Mānābharaṇa, who was at the head of 'the leaders of the soldiers', a personage who is referred to as the Damiḷa king Jayabāhu in the Cūlavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya ruled in Rājaraṭṭha contemporaneously with Māgha.[2] Jayabāhu, however, does not figure in the account of the actual invasion in which Māgha is described as the head of the army of 24,000 men.[3] Later in the narrative both these works mention Māgha and Jayabāhu together as Damiḷa kings ruling in Paṭiṭṭhāraṭṭa, whom Parākramabāhu wished to overthrow.[4] Like Māgha, Jayabāhu is also blamed in the Chronicles for repressive and impious acts such as the destruction of the vihāras.[5] The fortifications referred to above

---

[1] Cv., LIX, 40-45; LXIV, 18-19; Cv. Tr., I, 358, see Genealogical Table X.

[2] Tato Kāliṅgamāgham taṃ Mānābharaṇapubbakā yodhamukhyā bhisiñcimsu te Laṅkārajjalakkhiyaṃ, Cv., LXXX, 73; Cv., LXXXIII, 18-19; Pjv., 113-14.

[3] Cv., LXXX, 54 ff., Pjv., 108.

[4] Pjv., 113-14; Cv., LXXXII, 26-27.; P[illegible].

[5] Cv., LXXXII, 26-27; Pjv., 113-14.

are said to have been set up by Māgha and Jayabāhu.[1] It is clear from the contexts in which Jayabāhu figures that he was working in collaboration with Māgha.

Codrington made the following comments on Jayabāhu, puzzled by the difficulty of attempting an identification:

> 'The question is who was Jayabāhu? Was he Māgha's sub-king and successor or was he an independent but allied prince? The definite mention of two Malala and Dravida wars points to his independence; possibly he was a Chola though the use of the word in the Attanagalu Vamsa as meaning anything more than "Tamil" should not be pressed'.[2]

C. W. Nicholas has offered the suggestion that this Jayabāhu might be identified with the Codaganga who figures in a fragmentary Sanskrit inscription from Trincomalee.[3] The latter was evidently an invader, and the date of that record fits into this period. Apart from that there is no strong reason to confirm this suggestion. The record is fragmentary, but the name Jayabāhu does not occur in the preserved portion.[4] The possibilities indicated by these two scholars are interesting but unconvincing.

The Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa and its Sinhalese versions

---

[1] Pjv., 114, 116; Cv., LXXXIII, 15-26; LXXXII, 26-27.

[2] C.A.L.R., X, 47.

[3] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 619, note 26.

[4] Ep. Zeyl., V, 170 ff; text and translation, 174.

refer to 'the many thousands of enemy forces with their kings, the Colas, Keralas and the like, who had destroyed the world and the Sāsana and were living in Pulatthipura'.[1] This statement would hardly lend itself to the interpretation that Jayabāhu was a Cola, for Jayabāhu is nowhere mentioned by name. Secondly, we know that Māgha ruled at Polonnaruva and from the above statement it appears that there was a concentration of Keralas as well as Colas in Polonnaruva. As such, it would be difficult to infer that Māgha was the king of the Keralas or Malalas and that Jayabāhu was the king of the Colas, thereby making a nice distinction. Codrington was partly led to hint at the possibility that Jayabāhu could have been a Cola, on the statement in the Pūjāvaliya that Parākramabāhu fought a Malala war, a Dravida war and a Jāvaka war, implying the latter's conflict with Māgha, Jayabāhu and Candrabhānu respectively. It is true that this statement is virtually repeated in the Dambadeni Katikāvata, Nikāya Samgrahaya and the Saddharma Ratnākaraya.[2] In fact the Pūjāvaliya states that Parākramabāhu fought a Malala yuddha, a Dravida yuddha, a Jāvaka yuddha and many

---

[1] Hvv., 32, ...Pulatthipuravāsīnam kata lokasāsanavilopam sarājikam anekasahassaṅkham Cola-Keralavāhiniñ ca.... .

[2] Pjv., 117-18; Nks., 88; Sdh. Rtn., 314; Ktk. Sng., 8; Dravida Kerala Yāvakādī saturuviyavul sanhinduvā.

other wars, so that the implication of the statement appears to be a reference to the varied character of the enemy forces who were occupying Rajaraṭṭha, rather than to separate campaigns for the defeat of each of these categories. The Pūjāvaliya states elsewhere that he subjugated the Simhala Vanni (Kings) and secondly (deväniva) embarked on a Dravida war, in the account of which the list of fortifications built by Māgha and Jayabāhu already cited appears.[1] Then we are told that the forces of these two Damila kings, i.e. the Demala Malala maha senaga realized the prospect of imminent defeat and assembled in Polonnaruva in order to decide their future course of action.[2] Thus we see that the forces of both Māgha and Jayabāhu figure in the Dravida war to which the Malalas were certainly a party. Therefore it would not be fair to draw such a strict distinction between the Maḷāla yuddha and the Dravida yuddha as two different campaigns undertaken by Parākramabāhu.

---

[1] Codrington makes out that a second Dravidawar was fought (C.A.L.R., X, 46-47) but this passage would not lend itself to such an interpretation: piya rajahu sādhāgata nuhunu Simhala mahavannīn taman hun pala ma hiňda sādhā noyek rataval gena Lakdiva Simhala balasen taman karāma räs koṭa deväniva Dravida yuddhayakaṭa paṭan gena, Pjv., 116; the word on which such a suggestion could be based is deväni (second), but the text gives devänivay, which means 'secondly'. It is clear from the context that they firstly fought the Vanni kings and secondly embarked on the Dravida war. Note also the words Dravida yuddhayaṭa (the Dravida war) but not yuddhayakaṭa (a war).

[2] Pjv., 116-17; Cv., LXXXIII, 15-26.

The precise identity of Jayabāhu cannot be decided in the present state of our knowledge. There is, however, sufficient indication in the Cūlavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya that he was collaborating with Māgha. There they are mentioned together and so are their fortifications. Further, as stated earlier, in their hour of imminent defeat the forces of both these kings evidently acted together when they decided and assembled in Polonnaruva to consider the next course of action. Therefore it is sufficiently clear that they were in a common front. It can, of course, be argued that Māgha and Jayabāhu were independent kings but that they resorted to concerted action in facing a common danger from the forces of Parākramabāhu. But the references cited above would indicate that the alliance was perhaps more than a temporary device.

It would be reasonable to hold that Māgha had precedence in rank over Jayabāhu, whatever his relationship to the latter might have been. For, in the first place, the regnal years of Māgha are counted in all the principal Chronicles, but not those of Jayabāhu.[1] Secondly, the consecration of Māgha is specifically mentioned and his seat of authority was in Polonnaruva, the pre-eminent royal capital, to which even the Dambadeni kings yielded pride of place, as is evident from the desire of Parakramabāhu to hold his consecration there even towards the end of his reign.[2] It may also be

---

1. Cv., LXXX, 79; Pjv., 109; Rjv., 44.

2. Cv., LXXX, 71-73; LXXXVII, 67-70, LXXX, 74; Polonnaruva is referred to as mūlarājadhāni in Cv., LXXXIX, 8 and Pjv., 131.

noted that the name of Jayabāhu is preserved only in the Cūla-vaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya, whereas the Sinhalese Chronicles and the lesser works which refer to the activities of Māgha in detail or in brief as the case may be, do not mention Jayabāhu at all.[1] Therefore, there can be little doubt that Māgha was the chief figure and that Jayabāhu occupied a secondary position possibly as his ally. Like Māgha, however, Jayabāhu is mentioned as a 'Damiḷa king' and, if the latter actually figured in the Kaliṅga invasion led by Māgha, it is surprising that Jayabāhu is not mentioned in the account of the invasion. In these circumstances it may be suggested that Jayabāhu was a Damiḷa - possibly an invader who succeeded in establishing his authority in a part of Rājaraṭṭha in the troubled period which preceded the invasion of Māgha. The Chronicles refer to several invasions of the island, which took place during this period and a few inscriptions, too, bear testimony to the insecurity in which the Pôḷannuruva kings were placed partly on account of 'the Damiḷa confusion' (Demaḷa viyavul).[2] If Jayabāhu had been one such invader who achieved some success in the troubled waters, he appears to have yielded ground before the powerful army of Māgha and become his ally. Of this, however, we cannot be certain in view of the meagre data at our disposal.

---

[1] Nks., 87-88; Dal.S., 43; Rjr., 36 ff., Rjv., 44.

[2] See above, 116 ff.

The policy which Māgha followed, as reflected in the Cūlavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya, and in the later Chronicles, was one of ruthless repression and tyranny, at least in the first part of his reign. If the principal Chronicles are to be trusted, his reign was one of terror, in which atrocities of the highest magnitude were committed on an unprecedented scale. The Cūlāvaṃsa states:

> 'But since in consequence of the enormously accumulated various evil deeds of the dwellers in Laṅkā, the devatās who were everywhere entrusted with the protection of Laṅkā failed to carry out this protection, there landed a man who held to a false creed, whose heart rejoiced in bad statesmanship, who was a forest fire burning down the bushes in the forest of the good - that is generosity and the like - who was a sun whose actions closed the rows of night lotus flowers - that is the good doctrine - and a moon destroying the grace of the groups of the day lotuses - that is of peace - (a man) by name Māgha, an unjust king sprung from the Kāliṅga line, in whom reflection was fooled by his great delusion, landed as leader of four and twenty thousand warriors from the Kāliṅga country and conquered the Island of Laṅkā. The great scorching fire - King Māgha - commanded his countless flames of fire - his warriors - to harass the great forest - the kingdom of Laṅkā.'[1]

In this passage Geiger has pointed out the influence of Indian poetics (alaṅkāra), but that would not minimise the scorn in which the author of the Cūlāvaṃsa held the invader Māgha.[2]

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 54-59; see also Pjv., 108; Hvv., 30-31.

[2] Cv.Tr., II, 132, note 3.

The narrative continues with an account of the cruelties inflicted on the laymen as well as the Saṃgha by 'the Damiḷa warriors in imitation of the warriors of Māra'.

> 'While thus the great warriors oppressed the people, boasting cruelly everywhere, "We are Kerala warriors", they tore from people their garments, their ornaments and the like, corrupted the good morals of the family which had been observed for ages, cut off hands and feet and the like (of the people), destroyed many houses and tied up cows, oxen and other (cattle) which they made their own property. After they had put fetters on the wealthy and the rich people and had tortured them and taken away all their possessions, they made poor people of them. They wrecked the image houses, destroyed many cetiyas, ravaged the vihāras and maltreated the lay brethren. They flogged the children, tormented the five (groups of the) comrades of the Order, made the people carry burdens and forced them to do heavy labour.[1] Many books known and famous they tore from their cord and strewed them hither and thither. The beautiful vas, proud cetiyas like the Ratnāvalī (cetiya) and others which embodied as it were, the glory of the former pious kings, they destroyed by overthrowing them and alas! many of the bodily relics, their souls as it were, to disappear.'[2]

The ruling king Parākrama Pāṇḍya was captured and his eyes were put out. Polonnaruva was sacked and Māgha was consecrated in the capital city.[3]

---

[1] Geiger's translation of this strophe conveys too strong a sense, see below, 229 ff.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 61-69; Pjv., 108-109; see also Cv. Tr. II, 133, note 1; see below,

[3] Cv., LXXX, 71-73.

The Cūlavaṃsa goes on further to describe the disruption of the social order and the persecution of Buddhism.

> 'The monarch caused the people to adopt false views and brought confusion into the four unmixed castes.[1] Villages and fields, houses and gardens, slaves, cattle, buffaloes and whatever else belonged to the Sīhalas he had delivered to the Keraḷas. The vihāras, the pariveṇas and many sanctuaries he made over to one or other of his warriors as dwelling. The treasures which belonged to the Buddha and were the property of the holy Order he seized and thus committed a number of sins in order to go to hell. In this fashion committing deeds of violence the Ruler Māgha held sway in Laṅkā for twenty one years.'[2]

We quote at length from the Cūlavaṃsa, for it appears clearly that the policy which Māgha followed, apart from being one of repression, contains certain features which are in some respects almost unique. The destruction of the vihāras and image houses and so forth are of course referred to in connection with the Tamil invasions of earlier times.[3] These Damiḷa invaders too have been blamed in the Chronicles and, in fact, the Coḷas who invaded and occupied Rājaraṭṭha are called blood-sucking yakkhas (devils). Even so, the language used in the condemnation of Māgha can hardly find a a parallel in the accounts of the previous invasions. If Māgha's aim was plunder and loot and the spoliation of vihāras and shrines, some

---

[1] Geiger's translation of this strophe as: 'The Monarch forced the people to adopt a false faith and brought great confusion into the four sharply divided castes' conveys too strong a sense; Cv., LXXX, 75; See below, 299 ff.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 75-79; Pjv., 108-109.

[3] Cv., LIV, 44-45: LX, 56; Hvv., 31.

of which certainly possessed immense wealth, it is easily understandable. Even Sinhalese kings at times coveted this wealth and attempted the plunder of such institutions.[1] It would, however, be difficult to explain all his activities in terms of plunder and loot alone.

Amongst other sections of society the Saṃgha in particular were the target of his merciless onslaught. In addition to bodily harm done to the members of the Buddhist Order, many vihāras and parivenas were converted into residences for his soldiers. The property of the Order, possibly the lands, fields and other endowments, were seized and it is stated that Parākamabāhu II restored to the Saṃgha the villages which had been confiscated in this manner.[2] If we are to trust another passage occuring later in the Chronicle even the kinsmen of the Buddhist monks were deliberately subjected to harsh treatment. We are told that 'many kinsmen of the bhikkhu community who had become enslaved during the period of alien dominion and many other people he (i.e.Vijayabāhu IV) freed from their slavery by gifts to their masters of gold, precious stones and other valuables'.[3] There is good reason to believe that the Saṃgha suffered during this period

---

[1] Cv., LXI, 48 ff.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 76-78; LXXXIV, 1-4; Pjv., 118. Note also the plunder of monastic property and cetiyas, and the conversion of some of the vihāras in Polonnaruwa into residences for foreign soldiers by the successors of Jayabāhu I, Cv., LXI, 48-62.

[3] Cv., LXXXVII, 46-48; See Buddhadatta's Corrections to Geigers translation of the Cūlavaṃsa, U.C.R., VIII, 175; ...arājitayehi gäti dasva

(cont.)

not merely from lack of royal patronage, but apparently from deliberate persecution. Many Buddhist monks were compelled by these circumstances to leave Ceylon and take shelter in South India. This is confirmed by the subsequent statement in the Cūlavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya that these Buddhist monks were invited to return to Ceylon during the time of Vijayabāhu III.[1] The Daḷadasirita specifically states that Vijayabāhu recalled the great Mahātheras who migrated to foreign lands on account of the confusion caused by the Damiḷas /led by/ Māgha.[2] As we have shown elsewhere the Upāsaka Janālaṅkāra confirms this further for, as stated in this work, its author Bhandanta Ānanda was a victim of 'the fire of confusion caused by the Damiḷas' (Damiḷānala-samakule) who along with many other monks took shelter in the Pāṇḍya country. This work was composed while its author was thus resident in a vihāra (perum-palli) in the Paṇḍu-bhūmaṇḍala.[3] This would indirectly illustrate the point that political conflicts did not generally exclude religious relations be-

---

(cont.) giya Saṃghayāgē bandhūn hā duḥkhita janayan suvahas gaṇan ran ruvan dī siya gaṇan galavā aḷaha, Pjv., 130.

---

[1] Cv., LXXXI, 17-22; reference to monks who had settled in the Pāṇḍya and the Coḷa countries, Cv., LXXXIX, 67-68; Pjv., 109, 140.

[2] Māgharāja Demaḷa viyavulen paradesa giya pavara mahaterunvahansē ätuḷu vū mahasaṅgaṇa genvā, Daḷ.S., 43.

[3] Upāsaka Janālaṅkāra, see verses in the Colophon.

tween Ceylon and the Tamil country. It is in the light of this background that Māgha's conduct becomes even more strange.

The question is why did Māgha persecute the Buddhist Order in this manner? Was it motivated by political considerations? One possibility is that in order to establish his authority in Rāja-raṭṭha through repressive measures Māgha considered it expedient to weaken the influence of the Saṃgha in the political affairs of the country, thereby insuring himself against a quarter from which opposition to his rule was likely to flare up. Undoubtedly the leading members of the Buddhist Order wielded great influence, certainly in the time of Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II, when their opinion was taken into consideration even in the matter of settling the succession to the throne.[1] Was it a fear of this influential position of the Saṃgha, both at the court and with the Buddhist population, which angered Māgha and led him to a policy of persecution?

In favour of such a supposition is the fact that the other section of society which suffered heavily at the hands of Māgha were 'the wealthy and rich people', whose traditions of 'good morals of the family which had been observed for ages'. They suffered bodily harm by being fettered and mutilated in the limbs, and their wealth,

---

[1] Pjv., 130-31; Cv., LXXXVII, 39ff.

too, was seized.[1] Paranavitana has rightly taken this class to have been the nobles or the upper class of society, referred to as the kulīna, who were undoubtedly influential in the politics of the time.[2] It is therefore understandable that they became the victims of Māgha's repression.

Such an explanation is, however, unsatisfactory, if we accept the statement that children were flogged and people made to carry burdens and to do many kinds of work (bahukāriyaṃ). 'The five (groups of the) comrades of the Order', which included the female members of the Saṃgha, such as the bhikkhuni and sāmanerī, were similarly maltreated. The lay brethren (upāsaka) were beaten.[3] These acts, if the Chronicles can be trusted, show wanton cruelty, directed against members of the Buddhist Order. Some of these measures would hardly have been of any material benefit to an ad-

---

[1] Bandhitvāna vadhitvāna jane addhe mahaddhane
haritvāna dhanaṃ sabbaṃ daḷidde ca karimsu te, Cv., LXXX, 64.
Acchindimsu manussānaṃ sātakābharaṇādikaṃ
vicchindimsu kulacāraṃ cirakālānurakkhitaṃ, Cv., LXXX, 62.

[2] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 715-16; on the kulīnas see, Geiger, Cult. Cey. Med. Times, 29-30; women of this class (kulīna itthiyo, kulitthiyo) were treated with respect even by kings, Ibid., 30.

[3] tāḷayuṃ dārake pañca pīḷayuṃ Saṭhadhammike
hārayimsu jane bhāraṃ kārayuṃ bahukāriyaṃ, Cv., LXXX, 66.
Geiger's translation of the second part of this strophe as 'made the people to carry burdens and forced them to do heavy labour' is too strong. kārayuṃ bahukāriyaṃ would rather mean that they were made to do many duties' or services. The 'many duties' may include various types of compulsory labour for State services (rājakāriya).

venturer whose motives were no more than a desire for plunder and loot. On the other hand, even if we leave a reasonable margin for possible exaggeration in the Chronicle account, it immediately raises the question why such exaggeration was resorted to and why Māgha is condemned in a language almost unique in the treatment of foreign invaders in the Chronicles of Ceylon. In addition, the charges levelled against Māgha are also in some respects different from those attributed to, for example, the Colas in the Chronicles, in spite of the common accusations such as the plunder of vihāras and Buddhist shrines.[1]

In fact the author of the Pūjāvaliya begins his narrative in Chapter XXXIII by stressing the importance of Ceylon for the preservation of Buddhism. He adds:

> 'Therefore in this island of Laṅkā, the residence of those holding wrong views will not be permanent just as that of the yakkhas could not be permanent. Even if kings who hold wrong views ruled the island of Laṅkā by forcible occupation at some time their families have not been established due to the power of the Buddha himself. Therefore, as this island is fitting for kings with the right views their families will certainly flourish. For this reason, kings who are the lords of Laṅkā should cultivate love and reverence to the Buddha, and should not delay in the reestablishment of the Dispensation. /They should/ rule protecting the wheel of power and the wheel of

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 61 ff., esp. 66-67, 75; LC, 19 ff.

the Dhammas, thereby protecting their families.'[1]

Though this passage may reflect the general resentment of foreign invaders which has grown in the course of centuries, it may as well suggest the persecution of Buddhism by Māgha. And we know that the author of this work was a contemporary of Māgha. It would, therefore be interesting to find out why Māgha has received this harsh treatment in the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya.

In the account of Māgha, there are indeed a few indications which tend to suggest that political considerations alone were not the motivating factor. We are told that, 'The Monarch caused the people to adopt a false view,' and he 'brought great confusion to the four unmixed castes'.[2] The recourse to compulsion in the conversion of people into religious faiths was not the practice in Ceylon or in the Indian subcontinent, although there is some evidence of religious persecution in a few notable exceptions.[3] But this would not disturb the general picture of religious harmony which

---

[1] esē heyin mē Lakdiva mithyādṛṣṭi gatuvangē vāsaya pera yakṣayangē vāsaya sthira nuvuvā sēma sthira novēmaya. Mithyādṛṣṭi gat rajek Lakdiva balatkarayen kisikaleka rajya kalē vī namut ovungē vamśapratiṣṭhā novunu Budunge mā anubhāva viseṣayek ma ya. ese heyin me lakdiva samyakdṛṣṭi gat rajuntama sīhena heyin ungē kulapravēṇiya pavatinnṭē ma ekānta ma ya. mē kāraṇayen Lamkādhipati rajun visin Budun kerehi svabhāva vū ādara bahumānayen da Śāsana pratiṣṭhāvehi apramādava ajñācakra dharmacakra rakṣā koṭa rājya koṭa kulapravēṇiya rakṣā kaḷa yutu, Pjv., 49.

[2] Cv., LXXX-75; Pjv., 108-109.

[3] See below, 309-21.

prevailed among the followers of different faiths or different sects within the same faith. So the charged of forced conversion to a 'false view' levelled against Māgha is a strange statement, especially as previous invaders, who are also blamed for impious acts, are not accused of such deeds as compulsory conversion to their religious beliefs. It may be argued that the statement cited above should rather be treated as a general accusation against Māgha, who plundered their monasteries and harmed them in other ways. Such a view would receive some confirmation from the Pūjāvaliya , in which we are told that Parākramabāhu I resorted to foreign conquests because 'he was enraged by the kings of those countries who were of false faith, who on many occasions land in the island of Laṅkā and destroy the world and the Sāsana, and set out with the thought "I will conquer Jambudīpa and convert (it) into the true faith"'.[1] There can be little doubt that Parakramabāhu's foreign invasions were motivated by political considerations, but the author of the Pūjāvaliya and certain others recording the same tradition gave them a religious twist in order to impress upon the readers that their hero undertook these expeditions to promote the greater glory of the Sasana by converting Jambudipa into the 'true faith'. Even if this is the true implication of the Pūjāvaliya statement,

---

[1] ....Lakdiva noyek vārayehi bäsa lōkasāsanaya nasana heyin ē ē dēsavala mithyādṛṣṭigat rajunhaṭa udahasva "Dambadiva da sādhā samykdṛṣṭi ganvami' yi sitā Lakdiva mulullehi Siṃhala mahasenaṅga gena Daṁbadiv ṇikma...., Pjv., 106.

one can still doubt whether the charge of forced conversion of the people to a 'false view' has to be taken in the same light.

Against such an interpretation there is the further accusation against Māgha that 'many books known and famous they tore from their cord and strewed them hither and thither'.[1] What the 'known and famous 'books were is not stated here, but they were probably books concerning Buddhist doctrines which the Saṃgha professed. This is confirmed by a subsequent statement in the Cūlavaṃsa in the account of Vijayabāhu III, 'that on the Island of Laṅka so many books that dealt with the true doctrine had been destroyed by the alien foe', and that he arranged for the doctrines to be written down by men who were rewarded for their labour.[2] Similarly, Parākramabāhu II caused books on philosophy, logic and grammar and so forth to be brought from Jambudīpa for the instruction of bhikkhus.[3] There is no strong reason to distrust the statement that books containing Buddhist doctrines suffered at the hands of Māgha, not so much as an indirect consequence of the sack of Rājaraṭṭha, but rather as part of a conscious effort. It is difficult to believe that Māgha destroyed these books out of mere vandalism. Māgha may have had strong religious convictions

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 67.

[2] Cv., LXXXI, 40-45.

[3] Cv., LXXXVIV. 26-27; Pjv. 119.

which he tried to uphold at the expense of the Buddhist Faith which he thus persecuted.

The destruction of religious books would not have added to his material gains in any way; on the contrary, such a step would have enraged the Saṃgha as well as the lay Buddhists. In the few known instances, kings who tampered in this manner with books containing the religious doctrines were men who were moved by partisan religious sentiments. Perhaps the best known example is Mahāsena (278-302 A.D.) who became a convert to Vetulla doctrines and persecuted the Mahāvihāra whose inmates adhered to the Theravāda.[1] From a fragmentary inscription from Jetavanārāma, belonging to the reign of this monarch, we learn that he caused to be deposited in 'the five great āvāsas' (paca maha avasa) of the Mahāvihāra books which evidently contained the doctrines of the Vetullavāda, to be read by the inmates of these residences of the orthodox church.[2] In the sixteenth century Rājasiṃha I (1581-1593) of Sītāvaka, who gave up Buddhism and became a convert to Śaivism, is stated in the Cūlavaṃsa to have burned the sacred books and persecuted the Buddhist Order. It is stated that

> 'He annihilated the Order of the Victor, slew the community of the bhikkhus, burned the sacred books, destroyed the monasteries and thus barred his way to heaven. Become a (dead) tree-trunk in the cycle

---

[1] Mv., XXXVII.

[2] Ep. Zeyl., IV, No. 36, 273-85.

> of rebirths, he adopted a false faith.... In this way the impious fool as he did not know what he should accept, and accepted what he should not have accepted, brought evil upon himself'.[1]

His undisputed fame as a warrior has not spared him harsh condemnation in the Chronicle for his persecution of Buddhism. Thus the destruction of books by Māgha appears to have been a measure akin to that taken by Rājasiṃha as part of a policy of religious persecution.

Māgha is also accused of having brought confusion into the four castes. This is again a somewhat puzzling statement. Although the influence of the Indian caste system is reflected in the social developments in Ceylon, it never assumed the rigidity of the Indian divisions.[2] In fact, it is evident from certain statements in Niśśaṅka Malla's inscriptions that members of the Govi-kula, belonging to the Vaiśya class according to Indian terminology, were a powerful community contending for the capture of royal power.[3] In fact Niśśaṅka Malla holds out to his people that 'agriculture is the best occupation'.[4] Thus the reference to the four-fold division need

---

[1] Cv., XCIII, 10-13.

[2] Geiger, Cult. Ceyl. Med. Times, p.25, ff.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., II, No.17, 113-14, lines 14-18.

[4] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 17, 113, lines 12-13, tr. 122.

not be taken literally; perhaps it is the use of a conventional phrase to describe the disruption of society. It may partly refer to excesses likely to have been committed by Māgha's mercenaries that upset 'the good morals of the family which had been observed for ages'. However, Māgha cannot be blamed entirely for this confusion in the social order, for we learn that in the reign of Queen Kalyāṇavatī (1202-1208) general Āyasmanta 'separated the four castes, which had been mixed'.[1] The confusion in the social order appears to date back to an earlier time which saw many a foreign invasion and internal dissension, but was aggravated by the invasion of Māgha.

At this stage it is necessary to consider how far the account of Māgha in the Pali Chronicle and the Pūjāvaliya can be trusted. It may be conceded that the monks, authors of these works, exaggerated to some extent. But the lurid picture painted of him certainly suggests that many atrocities and excesses were committed, apart from religious persecution. The author of the Pūjāvaliya, who was almost an eye-witness of these events, is no less harsh in his condemnation of Māgha and his account agrees almost word to word with that of the Cūlavaṃsa. Paranavitana has contended that the kings who supplanted the Daṁbadeṇi dynasty were the Jāvaka descendants of Māgha and Candrabhānu.[2] This claim is partly based on the equation with 'Jāvaka'

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 41, saṃkiṇṇaṃ ca catubbaṇṇaṃ asaṃkiṇṇaṃ vidhāya so; Cf. Cv.Tr., II, 131

[2] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VII, 197 ff.;

with 'Savulu', the lineage to which some of these kings traced their descent. Sastri discussed in detail elsewhere why Māgha cannot be treated as a Jāvaka.[1] On the basis of this identification Paranavitana has expressed the view that the authors of the Nikāya Samgrahaya and the Saddharma Ratnākaraya, who wrote their works in the time of the Savulu or Jāvaka kings, have not used harsh language in the condemnation of Māgha and that the latter author has in fact exonerated him from such blame. In other words, these authors refrained from condemning a Jāvaka, namely Māgha, as the kings of the period were also Jāvaka descendants, who had extended their influence and come to power in the Sinhalese kingdom of the south of Ceylon. The Nikāya Samgrahaya gives the names of the fifteen kings who ruled after Parakramabāhu I and states that on their demise Kāliṅga Vijayabāhu, who had the first name Māgha, became king. It goes on further to state that on account of the great confusion, which prevailed in the first part of his reign, the Samgha fled from the ancient places such as Pulastipura to Māyāraṭa in search of protection, leaving behind the books and other 'articles of use' (pirikara) wherever they were. Then reference is made to the protection and generosity they received from Vijayabāhu and Parākramabāhu in Māyāraṭa.[2] Now the sequence of events given here agrees very well with that of the Cūlavamsa

---

[1] See J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VIII, 125-40.

[2] Nks. , 87-88.

and the Pūjāvaliya, with the difference that the account is less detailed, for it was limited in scope. The phrase '...Māgha nam lada pūrvābhidhāna äti Kāliṅga Vijayabāhu nam maharajahugē pūrgabhāga pravṛtta mahaviyavulin....[1] conveys clearly the sense that these troubles prevailed in the first part of his reign. It is, therefore, not quite correct to assume that Māgha has been exonerated from blame or that its author consciously tried to do so. Daladasdrita of 1325 A.D. refers to 'Māgha who converted śri Laṅkā to false views and destroyed the world and the Sāsana'. It also mentions the hardships of the members of the Saṃgha who fled to foreign lands on account of the confusion caused by Māgha's invasion.[2] The Saddharma Ratnākaraya of the fifteenth century, which follows the Nikāya Saṃgrahaya closely refers to these events with almost the same words, viz: '....Kāliṅga Vijayabāhu nam maharajahugē avadhiyata pūrvabhāgayehi pävati maha saturu viyavulin....', which, however, would imply that these troubles prevailed before the time of Māgha.3 The Saddharma Ratnākarya is in the main a collection of Buddhist stories, not an attempt to set out the history of these events connected with the Sāsana.[4] Nevertheless

---

[1] Nks., 87.

[2] Dal.S., 43, siri laka mityādṛṣṭi ganvā, lōsasun näsū Māgha raja.

[3] Sdh. Rtn., 313.

[4] For an account of this work see Godakumbura, Sinh. Lit., 94-97.

it gives a brief historical account, evidently following the Nikāya Saṃgrahaya. It is not unlikely that the author of the Saddharma Ratnākaraya, in paraphrasing the 'maharajahugē pūrvabhāgapravṛta mahaviyavulin' of the earlier work misinterpreted the phrase by having it in his work as maharajahugē avadhiyaṭa pūrvabhāgayehi pävati maha saturu viyavulin which conveys a somewhat different sense. Such a possibility is enhanced by another discrepancy in a detail occuring in the same paragraph. The Nikāyasaṃgrahaya states that when Poḷonnaruva was sacked 'monks fled in search of protectinn to Māyāraṭṭha, leaving behind their books, the articles of use and the like lying where ever they were'. The Saddharma Ratnākaraya which follows the former account almost word to word states that the fleeing monks collected the books and other articles and evidently brought them to Māyāraṭṭha.[1] This discrepancy, however, is a matter of detail to which the latter author probably gave little thought, but the statement conveys the opposite sense when compared with the Nikāyasangrahaya version. It is difficult to believe that the author of the Saddharma Ratnākaraya deliberately differed from the former concerning this detail. We would, therefore, be reluctant to concede that the author of the Saddharma Ratnākaraya had any intention of exculpating Māgha from the charges of persecuting Buddhism.

---

[1] Māgha nam lada pūrvābhidhāna äti, Kāliṅga Vijayabāhu nam maharajahugē pūrvabhāga pravṛtta mahaviyavulin Pulastipurādi purātana sthānayen igiḷa potpat ādi pirikara tubū tubū tena hāra, saraṇāveṣiva Māyārajayaṭa päminṇi mahā Saṅghayāṭa, Nks., 87.
Māgha nam vū pūrvābhidhāna Kāliṅgavijayabāhu maharajahugē avadhiyaṭa pūrvabhāgayehi pävati mahasaturuviyavulin Pulastipurādi vū purātana-sthānavalin igiḷa pat pot ādī śramaṇa pariṣkāra tubū tubū tänvalin uguḷuvāgena avut Māyā rajayaṭa päminṇa, Sdh. Rtn., 313.

The belief that the period covered by the brief reigns of the fifteen kings (twelve according to the Rājaratnākaraya) preceding Māgha was also one of confusion is easily understandable. That such confusion prevailed in this period is specifically stated in the Rājaratnākaraya which also belongs to the sixteenth century. It is significant to note that the latter which makes that statement also deals with the atrocities committed by Māgha in the manner of the authors of the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya.[1] It would, therefore, be unsafe to attach too much importance to the statement in the Saddharma Ratnākaraya and arrive at the inference that its author desired to exculpate Māgha.

The Nikāya Samgrahaya and the Saddharma Ranākaraya however would be in favour of the view that much of the atrocities of Māgha took place in the first part of his reign. It may also be clear from our discussion of the political background of the period prior to the invasion of Māgha that it was one of confusion, as is specifically stated in the Rājaratnākaraya.[2] Once his authority was established in Rājarattha there was perhaps less need to enforce the rigour and repression with which he set out to wrest power. It is also unlikely that such a drastic policy of repression and persecution

---

[1] Rjr., 36-37.

[2] See above, 113ff. Rjr., 37.

was followed through his period of rule, as we are told in the Pūjāvaliya he continued to hold sway for 40 years.[1] In spite of the strength of his army, and however weak the position of the Sinhalese might have been, it would have been difficult for him to continue in power for so long unless he modified his repressive policies to some extent. All the more so, in view of the fact that unlike the case of the Colas there is also no indication that he had the active support of a South Indian power.

None of our sources refers to specific measures of improvement in the latter part of his reign. In fact the picture painted of the local chieftains in the Cūlavamsa such as Ādipāda Bhuvanekabāhu and Sēnāpati Sankha who ruled in different parts of the island, would not indicate that any appreciable change in the policies of Māgha had taken place.[2] But then we have to remember that the Pali Chronicle has the highest condemnation for Māgha and we cannot expect its author to have a good word for Māgha even if he deserved any. The persecution and repression which he pursued in the first part of his reign would have left such bitter memories that the chroniclers would have remained silent on any improvement in the latter part of his reign.

It is very likely that the Damilas, who were a considerable

---

[1] Pjv. 116.

[2] See above, 194-97.

part of the population of Rājaraṭṭha extended their support to Māgha. They had at times supported the invading armies from South India in the past and possibly Māgha could count on their sympathies.[1] Such a possibility is indicated by a subsequent reference in the Cūlavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya where the strength of the forces of Māgha and Jayabāhu is placed at 44,000 and 40,000 respectively, as against the 24,000 strong army with [illegible] which Māgha invaded Ceylon.[2] These figures in themselves need not be taken as trustworthy, but it is reasonable to hold that some increase of the forces had taken place subsequent to the invasion. The Damilas who were already in Rājaraṭṭha would have joined the ranks of Māgha for it is clear from the Cūlavaṃsa that they were given a very generous share of the loot, as part of the reward for their loyalty and services.[3] It may be a reasonable inference that the sack of Rājaraṭṭha by Māgha and his repressive policies, though not necessarily followed throughout his rule, was a shattering blow to the Sinhalese kingdom which was already on the decline.

A question that would naturally arise from the foregoing discussion of the policies followed by Māgha is why he resorted to a re-

---

[1] S.H.C., 57.

[2] Cv., LXXXIII, 20; Pjv., 116.

[3] Cv., LXXX, 76-78.

pression and persecution of Buddhism, which is in a clear contrast to the policies of his Kāliṅga predecessors. The Kāliṅga kings generally and the Nissaṅka Malla in particular, extended their patronage to Buddhism with great enthusiasm and tried to win over the confidence of the Buddhists through benevolent measures, in order to secure the throne of Ceylon for the Kāliṅga family.[1] Our sources do not give a positive answer to this question, but from the accounts of Māgha we have so far considered it appears that Māgha was a man of a different temperament with tendencies towards religious fanaticism. It is possible to concede that in view of the insecurity of the time and the quick termination of the reigns of his Kāliṅga predecessors, he thought it more expedient to suppress all quarters of opposition to the rule of the Kāliṅga line by violent methods. But such a view would not sufficiently explain his persecution of Buddhism effected in so ruthless a manner.

The Cūlavaṃsa uses the word micchādiṭṭhi ('wrong views') to denote 'the false views' to which Māgha is said to have converted the people of Rājaraṭṭha. Geiger translated this part of this important strophe as: 'The Monarch forced the people to adopt a false faith'.[2] The word micchāditthi literally means 'wrong views'.[3] This term need

---

[1] See above, 120-22.

[2] Micchādiṭṭhiṃ sa bhūpālo gaṇhāpetvā mahājanaṃ, Cv., LXXX-75.

[3] See, The Pali-English Dictionary, P.T.S., p.156.

not necessarily connote a 'false faith'. For, in the Dīghanikāya 'wrong views' held by members of the Buddhist Order are also called micchādiṭṭhi. But, in later times, however, this term may have acquired a stronger connotation as is suggested by the Pūjāvaliya passage cited above.[1] Similarly, the translation of the gaṇhāpetvā as 'forced' would convey a sense somewhat stronger than the context demands. This part of the strophe may be accordingly rendered as: 'The Monarch caused the people to adopt wrong views'. In order to achieve this objective whether Māgha offered any inducements to those whom he wanted to be converted to his 'wrong views' is not stated in any of our sources. Though the word gaṇhāpetvā does not necessarily suggest the use of force, by implication it contains an element of compulsion involved in the alleged conversion. The plunder of the monasteries, the illtreatment of the Saṃgha as well as of the lay devotees (upāsaka), the confiscation of the belongings of 'the wealthy and rich people' and the harsh treatment meted out to them would point towards conversion by compulsion rather than by peaceful methods of persuasion.

Here a further point calls for clarification. Who really were the mahājana ('the people') who were compelled to adopt micchādiṭṭhi.?

---

[1] Dīghanikāya, Saṅgīti Suttānta, III, 246. cf. account of Eḷāra in Mv., XXI, 13-34, and Pjv., 85-87; Rjv., 18.

The word mahājana stands for 'a great crowd, collectively for "the people" or a multitude'.[1] Apart from this sense it also means in Sanskrit 'a great or eminent man, great persons; the chief of a trade or caste, a merchant, banker, tradesman'.[2] Though the first is the best known meaning of this word, the second should not be ruled out. In fact there is some reason to prefer the latter sense as more suitable to the context, and to render it as 'notables' or 'eminent men'. We have already referred to the confiscation of the property of wealthy men in addition to causing them bodily injury.[3] The reference to 'the good morals of the family which had been observed for ages', which the mercenaries 'corrupted' would call to mind the upper class in society denoted by terms like kulīna and kulaputto.[4] It is even more significant to note that the strophe immediately following the reference to the mahājana refers to the confiscation of the possessions of the Sīhalas. These included 'villages and fields, houses and gardens, slaves, cattle and buffaloes'.[5] The nature of these possessions which are characteristic of the higher sections of the society may imply that they were not the common people.

---

[1] See, The Pali-English Dictionary, P.T.S., p.150.

[2] See, A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Monier Williams, 755.

[3] Cv., LXXX-64.

[4] Wilhelm Geiger, Cult. Cey. Med. Times, 29-30, 205.

[5] Cv., LXXX-76.

One may therefore take note of the possibility that Mahājana may refer to persons of the upper strata in society and not necessarily to 'the people' in the ordinary sense of the word. If this was the case, then an attempt seems to have been made to compel them to adopt his 'wrong views' after confiscating their wealth.

However, reasonable objections can be raised against interpreting the term mahājana as 'notables' or 'eminent men'. For, although the term conveys this sense also in Sanskrit usage, in Pali the term occurs more often in the sense of 'the people'. In fact, in the Pali Chronicle as well as in the Sinhalese literary works the term is used in the latter sense. In the account of the First Buddhist Council the Mahāvaṃsa refers to the theras 'who had made their pilgrimage over Jambudīpa, consoling here and there the sorrowing people'.[1] The term mahājana here refers to people in various parts of Jambudīpa, who bemoaned the death of the Buddha, and it does not convey the sense of 'notables' or 'eminent men'. In the account of Parākramabāhu's military operations to bring the island under his rule we are told: 'Then he sent his train of hunters and robbers and the like, who were skilled in wandering by night in the wilderness of the forest and mountain and had many people (mahājana) slain by them night and day'.[2] The Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa states that when king Sirisaṅgabodhi

---

[1] Mv., III 13-14.

[2] Cv., LXXII, 208-209.

was considering abdication, he was moved by the prospect of great suffering which may fall on the people because of him, in the event of a war between the two opposing armies.[1] Similarly in the account of the restoration of Polonnaruva during the reign of Parākramabāhu II, the Pūjāvaliya states that irrigation works were restored making that region prosperous and that that area was resettled with lacs of people.[2] Parākramabāhu II gathered 'a great multitude of the inhabitants of Laṅkā (Laṅkāvāsīmahājanam) and had the great highway from the town of Jambuddoṇi to splendid Pulatthinagara' improved and decorated for the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl Relics to be taken to the latter city.[3] A Pali stanza at the end of the DaladāPūjāvaliya calls upon kings to rule with justice without violating the canons of statecraft and pleasing their subjects (mahājanam).[4] Other clear examples of the use of this term in this sense can be cited.[5] In all these contexts, the term mahājana is mentioned quite clearly in the sense of 'people'. This would militate against taking the mahājana whom Māgha is said to have caused to adopt 'wrong views' as 'notables'

---

[1] evaṃ sat maṃ nissāya ubhayapakkhagatassa mahājanassa vipulaṃ dukkham bhavissati, Hvv., 20, para.13; see also Elu Av., 51.

[2] lakṣa gaṇa manuṣyayangen mahajana gahaṇa karavā, Pjv., 138.

[3] Cv., LXXXIX, 13-15.

[4] Rājadhamma mako pento - rañjayanta mahājanaṃ
rāja no pi ciraṃ sammā - pālayantu vasundharā, Dal. Pjv., 65.

[5] Jkm., 21, 81, 88; Ep. Zeyl., IV, No.33, p. 258, line 21.

or 'eminent men'. Even leaving allowance for exaggerations, that this term in the account of Māgha refers to people in a general sense is consistent with the Pūjāvaliya statement which refers to Māgha's 'having caused Śrī Laṅkā to adopt wrong views'.[1] In spite of the considerations given earlier, therefore, we may take the mahājana to have meant the people rather than the notables or eminent men.

Whichever connotation is given to the word micchāditthi, here we have the implication of compulsory conversion to certain religious beliefs. As stated earlier, micchāditthi is a general term which cannot be of much assistance in determining the religious faith to which Māgha belonged. But from the account of his persecution of Buddhism one gets the impression that he was not a Buddhist. Geiger has equated his 'false faith' with Hinduism.[2] If he was a Hindu, as indeed he appears to have been, the particular sect - such as Śaiva or Vaiṣṇava - to which be longed cannot bē determined in the absence of data bearing on the subject. Archaeological exploration in Rājarattha has so far brought to light no religious monuments erected by him or datable in his reign.[3] The Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava dēvālas in

---

[1] siri laka mityādṛṣṭi ganvā, Pjv., 108-9; same in Dal. S., 43.

[2] Cv.Tr., II, see note to LXXX-75.

[3] Paranavitana gives an account of the remains of a Śiva Dēvālaya to the north of the Northern Gate of Polonnaruva. This shrine, which measures 39 feet east to west and 18 feet north to south, has the usual features of a Hindu dēvālaya. Stone images of Siva,

(cont.)

Polonnaruva are generally regarded as monuments erected during the Cola occupation of Rājarattha (c.1017-70).[1] In many cases this view is confirmed by the Tamil inscriptions of the time of the Cola kings like Rājarāja I and Rājendra I found at the sites of these monuments.[2] It is unfortunate that so far no epigraphic records or monuments datable in the reign of Māgha have come to light.

Considering the spirit of religious tolerance which led Indian kings throughout the ages not merely to permit the free exercise of religious worship, but often to encourage and patronise religions and religious sects other than their own, the persecutionist policies and religious intolerance shown by Māgha appear almost unique.[3] It may, however, be pointed out that, though this religious tolerance on the whole remained unchanged, a few striking exceptions took place about this time. Harsa of Kashmir (1089-1101 A.D.) carried out measures

---

(cont.) Nandin, Ganesa, and a liṅgam of polished stone placed on a pedestal in the shape of a yoni were found. A pillar with an inscription of Jayabāhu I (1110-11) was discovered; it has been suggested that this pillar and some other stones had been taken from an earlier building to build this shrine. A coin of Sāhassamalla (1200-02) was found in the debris. It has been suggested that this shrine may belong to the reign of Māgha, but there is no epigraphic or other evidence which would confirm this date. A.S.C.A.R., 1934, 16-17, see also plate IX.

---

[1] C.H.J., IV, 83-82; U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 589-90.

[2] A.S.C.A.R., 1908, 3-11: 1907, 37-38: 1960, 72-76.

[3]

which clearly display a violation of the characteristic Indian tradition of religious tolerance. These activities, which are vividly described in the Rājataraṅgiṇī, bear a strong analogy to the conduct of Māgha.[1] Like Māgha he, too, plundered the enormous wealth of the temples 'for extravagant expenditure upon various corpse of his army'. But that was only one reason. A certain Udayaraja was appointed for the purpose of destroying the images of gods (devotpāṭanānāyaka).[2] Members of the local purohita Corporation, who were evidently Brāhmaṇas, were forced to carry loads (rudhabhārodhi) a measure to which Māgha also had recourse.[3] The acts of desecration by Harṣa are vividly described:

> 'In order to defile the statues of gods he had excrements and urine poured over their faces by naked mendicants whoses noses, feet and hands had rotted away. Divine images made of gold, silver and other (materials) rolled about even on the roads which were covered with night soil, (as if they were) logs of wood. Crippled naked mendicants and the like covered the images of gods, which were dragged along by ropes round their ankles with spitting instead of flowers. There was not one temple in a village, town or in the city which was not despoiled of its images by that Turuṣka, king Harṣa. Only two chief divine images were respected by him, the illustrious Ranasvāmin in the city, and Mārtāṇḍa (among the images) in townships'.[4]

Two Buddha images, one at Parihāsapura and the other in the city, are said to have been saved due to requests made by the singer Kanaka

---

[1] Rājataraṅgiṇī, I, (VII), 1087 ff, see also A. L. Basham, B.S.O.A.S, x, 688-91.

[2] Rājataraṅgiṇī, I, (VII), 1089, 1091.

[3] Rājataraṅgiṇi, VII, 1088; Cf. Cv., LXXX, 66.

[4] Rājataraṅgiṇi, VII, 1092-96.

and the Śramaṇa Kusalaśrī 'at a time when he was free with his favours'.[1] Even if we leave a margin for exaggerations, there is little doubt that the above account clearly reflects an attitude of religious intolerance and positive persecution rarely met with in Indian history. It may also be noted that Harṣa is referred to as a 'Turuṣka' - a term by which the Muslims, known for their iconoclastic zeal, are denoted. Kalhaṇa calls him a 'Bhairava of a king'.[2]

The inhuman cruelties which Harṣa is stated to have inflicted on the Dāmaras and the Lavanyas are also reminiscent of the excesses committed by Māgha to some extent. We are told that 'Since he impaled even travellers, taking them for Lavanyas, the country became terrible to look at, (just as if it had been) Bhairava's kitchen'.[3]

> 'The governor sent to the Bhairava of a king whole strings and rows of Lavanya heads (just as if they were) a great offering. At the gate of the king's palace there were seen everywhere rows of triumphal arches (toraṇa) covered with Dāmara skulls, which appeared like cups (ghaṭī).'[4]

> 'Vultures, herons and (others) frequented king's gateway and occupied the spreading arches to feast on the heads of the Dāmaras.'[5]

> 'In this land, which was filled with corpses, just as (if it had been) a burning ground, the nose was tormented by impure smells and the ear by the howls of the jackals'.[6]

---

[1] Rājataraṅgiṇī, VII, 1097-98.

[2] Rājataraṅgiṇī, VII, 1095, 1233.

[3] Rājataraṅgiṇī, VII, 1230.

[4] Rājataraṅgiṇī, VII, 1233-34.

[5] Rājataraṅgiṇī, VII, 1236

(cont.)

This description is clothed in poetic language, but that would not minimise the significance of the merciless cruelties inflicted on god and man alike. The parallel in the religious persecution and the cruelties practised by Harṣa and Māgha, both being near contemporaries, ruling two different kingdoms situated in the northern and southern extremes of the subcontinent is both striking and interesting. It at least illustrates that Māgha's religious intolerance and atrocities are not necessarily so unique as they appear at first sight.

Some evidence of religious unrest if not intolerance is forthcoming from the Karṇāṭaka country in Southern India during this period, when the Kalacuri kings ruled there with their capital at Kalyāṇi. Religious unrest showing signs of persecution prevailed there in the relations between the Jainas and the Śaivas who came to prominence there at this time. This 'new sect of Śivabhaktas' as Fleet calls them, rose to prominence in the 12th century and are generally known as 'Vīraśaivas' meaning 'brave, fierce or strict Śaivas - Śaiva champions' and popularly called Liṅgāyats or Liṅgavants meaning 'those who have the liṅga or phallic emblem'.[1] To this day the followers of this Śaiva sect constitute about 35 per cent of the population in the

---

(cont.)

[6] Rājataraṅgini, VII, 1238.

---

[1] J.F. Fleet, Ep. Ind., V, 239, 237-60; Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, 477-84.

Belgaum and Dhārwār districts of the Kanarese country. In Mysore and Kōlhāpur state, as well as in Poona, Sholāpur and Sātārā, they are a considerable element in the population.[1]

Fleet gives an account of the Vīraśaiva sect. Among their chief characteristics are noted the adoration of the liṅga which they carry about 'usually in a silver box suspended from the neck and hanging about the waist', adoration of Śiva's bull Nandin, hostility to Brāhmaṇas, disbelief in the transmigration of the soul, dislike of child marriage, and the approval and practice of the remarriage of widows. Some of these tenets are a clear departure from orthodox Hinduism.[2] Dr. S. C. Nandimath attempted to refer Vīraśaivism to the more ancient past as against Fleet, who dated its emergence in the 12th century A.D.[3] Nilakanta Sastri defended the stand taken by Fleet, but preferred to regard Basava who figures in the Puraṇas, which treat of the history of this movement, as its founder.[4] Fleet was strongly of opinion that the founder of this movement was Ekāntada Rāmayya who figures in the Ablur Inscription.[5]

---

[1] Fleet, Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, 477-78.

[2] Fleet, Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, 477; Ep. Ind., V, 239; A Handbook of Vīraśaivism, Dharwar (1942) Ch. IV, 50.

[3] S. C. Nandimath, A Handbook of Vīraśaivism, 3 ff.

[4] 'A note on Vīraśaivism - its History and Doctrines', 18th All In. Or. Conf., (1958), 389-91.

[5] Ep. Ind., V, 239-45.

The story of the foundation of the Vīraśaivism and the relations of this sect with the Jainas are contained in the Basava Purāṇa and the Channabasava Purāṇā written in Kannaḍa, and in the Jaina version in the Bijjalarāyacarita.[1] Fleet expressed strong distrust of these purāṇas which contain differences within the story as told by them, in addition to other differences when compared with the Jaina version.[2] According to these works the Kalacuri king Bijjala even lost his life in a conspiracy arising from the disputes and uneasy relations between the two sects. Basava and his nephew Channabasava figure as having propagated the new faith 'which included persecution and extermination of all persons - especially the Jainas whose creed differed from that of the Liṅgāyats'.[3] In the Jaina version of these legends, namely the Bijjalarāyacarita, it is stated that Bijjala died of poisoning by a Jangama dressed in the guise of a Jaina, sent by Basava. Before his death, Bijjala is stated to have instructed his son Immadi Bijjala to put Basava to death. We are told that Immadi Bijjala ordered the execution of the Jangams wherever they were seized. On hearing the news Basava is

---

[1] Basava Purāṇa, Ed. Appaji Appaṇṇappannavar, (Rājeśvarī Press), 1914; for a summary of the contents of these Śaiva Purāṇas see J.R.A.S. Bombay Br., VIII, 65-97, 98-221.

[2] Ep. Ind., V, 242 ff.; Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, 477-84.

[3] Ep. Ind., V, 240.

said to have jumped into a well and died.[1] Whatever may be the truth of these claims and counter-claims by these two parties, these accounts reflect the uneasiness and conflict which embittered the relations between the Jainas and this extreme Śaivite sect. This is of considerable significance in the light of the strong traditions of religious tolerance in India, occurring as it did at a time when similar but rare instances are known from other parts of India.

Among the tenets of Vīraśaivism their anti-Brāhmaṇical attitude is of some interest to us. Basava is stated to have refused to be invested with the Brāhmaṇical thread, claiming that he had come to destroy the distinctions of caste.[2] Nandimath, however, tried to explain that this was merely a revolt from within the Brahmaṇical fold as much as Buddhism and Jainism were from without.[3] But Nilakanta Sastri admits rightly that 'the career of Basava was a definite and conscious break from Brahmanism and even according to the Purāṇas the Brāhmaṇas were as much the opponents of Basava as the Jainas'.[4] Although this was evidently not a movement of universal opposition to distinctions of caste, the initiates into Liṅgāyatism appear to have been free of disabilities arising from considerations of caste.

---

[1] Ep. Ind., V, 242.

[2] Ep. Ind., V, 240; A Handbook of Vīraśaivism, 87 ff.

[3] A Hand Book of Vīraśaivism, 53.

[4] Eighteenth All Ind. Or. Conf., 388.

In this connection we are reminded of the charge levelled against Māgha that in addition to converting the people to a 'false view', he 'mixed the four castes which were (previously) unmixed'.[1] Before any significance can be attached to this statement we must take note of another statement in the same text that in the reign of queen Kalyāṇavatī 'the four castes which had become mixed' were separated.[2] The two statements are made almost in identical words. Taken along with the latter, it may seem that the reference is to the general confusion in the social order which may have been caused in this period of foreign invasions and political unheavels. But it would be interesting to find out whether this statement conveys a sense beyond this general implication.

The same text informs us in its account of Māgha that the Kerala warriors 'corrupted the good morals of the family which had been observed for ages'.[3] This may be regarded as a reference to the excesses committed in the sack of Rājaraṭṭha, in the course of which violation

---

[1] asaṃkiṇṇaṃ catubbaṇṇaṃ saṃkiṇṇaṃ akarī bhusaṃ, Cv., LXXX-75. Geiger's translation that 'he brought great confusion into the four sharply divided castes' is too strong. Cv.Tr., LXXX-75.

[2] saṃkiṇṇaṃ ca catubbaṇṇaṃ asaṃkiṇṇaṃ vidhāya so, Cv. LXXX-41. Here too Geiger's translation as 'having scrupulously separated the four castes which had become impure through mixture' forces too strong a sense; see, Cv.Tr., LXXX-41.

[3] vicchiṃdiṃsu kulacaraṃ cirakālānurakkhitaṃ, Cv., LXXX-62.

of women by the mercenaries might have taken place. But reading the Pūjāvaliya version one suspects it was a calculated measure and not merely an allusion to the excesses commonplace in the conduct of mercenary soldiers in times of war. The Pūjāvaliya states: '...lakdiva kulastrīngē jātisambheda koṭa kuladaruvan sīvāsi karavā...'[1] Kuladaruvan and kulastrīn generally refer to men and women of respectable families in the upper strata of society.[2] The first part of the Pūjāvaliya statement may be rendered as 'having (caused breach in the families of, or) brought confusion into the families of the respectable women'. If the statement ends here it can be explained as the excesses of the soldiers at the hands of whom these women suffered molestation. But there is the additional statement viz. kuladaruvan sīvāsi karavā, which presents some difficulty. The word sīvāsi occurs in Sinhalese literature as 'one who practises agriculture'.[3] In this sense the phrase would mean 'having made the nobles to take to agriculture'. In that case we have to believe that the nobles were degraded to the position of those engaged in agriculture. One may, however, raise the question whether such a step would have led to the social degradation of these men. Whatever be the occupational and caste divisions in ancient Ceylon,

---

[1] Pjv., 108.

[2] See Sumaṅgala Śabdakoṣaya, 263-64; Geiger, Cult.Cey.Med.Times, see kulaputtā, 205, kulīña itthiyo, kulatthiyo, pp. 29-30.

[3] Sorata Thera, Sumaṅgala Śabdakoṣaya, 1059; Saddharma Ratnāvaliya. 712.

agriculture was not looked down upon as a low occupation.[1] In the twelfth century they were certainly an important community. Niśśanka Malla warned them not to aspire to kingship. This statement itself is suggestive of the influence they wielded at the time. However, this monarch refers to agriculture as 'the best occupation' in one of his inscriptions.[2] It is extremely unlikely that a social stigma was attached to the practice of agriculture, which to this day continues to be the main occupation of the people of Ceylon.

As a possible alternative it may be suggested that the word sīvāsi is a derivation from the Pali sahavāsa which conveys the sense of 'living together'.[3] Thus the entire statement appears to mean that confusion was brought by causing co-habitation in contravention of the morals accepted at the time. But the implication of the statement is not yet clear. It can be asked that since marital relations between kuladaruvan and kulastrīn were usual, what social confusion could have arisen in such a situation. As this is a valid objection to this interpretation, the earlier explanation based on the best known meaning of the word sīvāsi appears more satisfactory.

---

[1] B. B. Aryapala, Society in Mediaeval Ceylon, 284-292; Geiger, Cult. Cey. Med. Times, 30.

[2] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 17, p.113-14, lines 14-18, tr. 122.

[3] See Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Monier Williams, p. 1100, 'one who lives with another, a fellow lodger, dwelling together'; Pali-English Dictionary, p.T. S., 'living together, associating'.

It is true, as we have pointed out, that agriculture was not looked down upon as a low occupation, but if the nobles were compelled to take to cultivation of the land instead of their normal duties, it would not have been locked upon with favour by this class. In fact it would have led to a diminution of their influence. Māgha is also stated to have made the people carry burdens and do 'many duties' (bahu kāriyam) which probably was a form of rājakāriya.[1] Similarly the nobles appear to have been made to till the land. The exact implication of the statement, however, remains uncertain, but it seems to reflect a conscious effort on the part of Māgha to tamper with the social order with some motive or other.

Our suspicion is increased by the Rājāvaliya which goes even a step further. We are told that he 'wrought confusion in castes by reducing to servitude people of high birth in Laṅkā, raising people of low birth and holding them in esteem, (he) spread (his) fame (and) reduced to poverty respectable people'.[2] According to this text Māgha appears to have interfered in the social order by upsetting the traditional scales which determined their relative positions. We may not, however, ignore the fact that the Rājāvaliya is much later in date than both the principal sources cited above.

---

[1] hārayimsu jane bhāram kārayum bahukāriyam, Cv., LXXX, 66.

[2] lakdiva kulavāsīn atavāsikaravā hīnayan utum karavā kīrti pavatvā jātibheda karavā kuladaruvan diliṅdu karavā, Rjv. 44; Rjv.Tr. 53; See, however, Cv., LXI, 50 where an earlier Sinhalese king had taken a similar measure.

In spite of the confused nature of these accounts, we are inclined to suggest that they contain a reflection of a conscious attempt by Māgha to reduce the influence which the kuladaruvan wielded in society. It is difficult to detect his motive, but in all probability it appears to have been a political measure calculated to reduce the influence of the nobility - at any rate the more influential section in society. One cannot, therefore, venture to suggest that Māgha shared a tenet of the Vīraśaivas in his attitude to caste. As shown by Geiger the 'four castes' (catubbanna)has to be taken as conventional phraseology denoting the social order generally.[1] For, though the four-fold division was known in Ceylon, it never assumed the rigidity of the Indian system.[2] It may, however, be noted that Karṇāṭas who were probably not unfamiliar with the teachings of this extremist Śaiva sect, which had risen to prominence in their country served in the armies of the Sinhalese kings in the twelfth century, along with the Keraḷas - their neighbours in the south.

We may also draw attention to a few more indications in other parts of South India, where a feeling of uneasiness and strain coloured the relations between the Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava sects, as well as their attitude to the Jainas and the Buddhists, side by side with glowing

---

[1] Cult. Cey.Med.Times, 25; see also above,

[2] Cult. Cey.Med.Times, 22-30; Ariyapala, Society in Medieaval Ceylon, 290, 292.

examples of the spirit of religious tolerance which, it must be emphasised, remained on the whole unchanged. A well known instance of religious intolerance in the Col country was the persecution of Rāmānuja, though the kings never followed an anti-Vaisnava attitude as a part of their policy.[1] Kulottunga II in his ardent attachment to Saivism removed the statue of Visnu from its position in the celebrated temple of Chidambaram.[2] There are also other examples of disputes between Saiva and Vaisnava temples which needed the intervention of royal authority for settlement.[3] Attention has been drawn to a recorded case, when the mahāsabhā of Tirukkadaiyūr 'resolved that any Māhesvaras who, contrary to their tenets as custodians of the Siva temple and its observances, mixed freely with Vaisnavas, would forfeit their property to the temple'.[4] These are rare instances, but they are none the less significant in the history of the relations between Indian religions.

Some of the Tamil literary works also contain hints of mutual suspicion and animosity in the relations between different sects and creeds in South India. Attention has been drawn to a story in the

---

[1] The Colas, 644.

[2] A.R.E., 363 of 1907; The Colas, 645, 362, note 49.

[3] A.R.E., 387 of 1906; see also A.R.E., 1907, p.69, para 26; this inscription is assigned to Māravarman Sundara Pāndya II (1239-51 A.D.).

[4] A.R.E., 257 of 1925; The Colas, 645.

Tiruvilaiyādar Purāṇam which speaks of the śramaṇas (Buddhist or Jaina) who were unhappy about the flourishing condition of Śaivism in the Pāṇḍya capital and sent three supernatural agents in the form of an elephant, a cobra and a cow for the destruction of Madhurā. On these occasions the tutelary deity of Madhurā - Sandaresa - is said to have come to the rescue by petrifying these destructive agents into the hills of Anamalai, Nāgamalai and Pasumalai in the neighbourhood of Madhurā.[1] Vaiṣṇava legends contain a story of Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār in which he is said to have despoiled the Buddhist Vihāra at Negapatam of a golden image of the Buddha in order to secure the wealth required to build the Raṅganātha Temple at Śrīraṅgam.[2]

These stories, however, cannot reveal anything more than the underlying uneasiness and suspicion in the relations between the different sects and creeds. Nilakanta Sastri has rightly issued 'a warning against a wholesale acceptance of the stories of the persecution and extirpation of Jainism and Buddhism, so freely retained in the hagiology of the Hindu sects'.[3] To cite but one example in justification of the position taken by this scholar we refer to the Tiruvendipuram Inscription of the time of Rājarāja III and the Hoysala Narasiṃha II, which mentions the rescue of this Cola king by the latter, when

---

[1] A.R.E., 1926-27, pp. 74-75, para. 8.

[2] A.R.E., 1899, pp. 12-13; K. N. Sastri, New India, V, No. 22, (1956).

[3] The Colas, 656.

the rebel Kopperuñjiṅga raised a revolt against the Coḷa king and took him captive. In this record we are told that Naṟasiṃha heard that Kopperuñjiṅga had taken the Coḷa emperor captive at Śēṇḍamaṅgalam, that he had destroyed the kingdom with his army and that the temples of god (Śiva) and the places (sacred to) Viṣṇu were destroyed.[1] Now this allegation of the destruction of temples by Kopperuñjiṅga made by the latter's opponent can hardly be accepted, for we have epigraphic records of Kopperuñjiṅga recording endowments to temples, one of which is the Sanskrit Inscription at Drākṣārāma wherein he is called a worshipper Kaṇakasabhādhināṭha.[2] In these circumstances, these examples would hardly lead to a conclusion that the spirit of religious tolerance was no more, especially in view of the numerous examples pointing to the contrary.

But it would be reasonable to infer that in about the 12th century there was certainly an underlying element of mutual suspicion and animosity, which on rare occasions found open expression in religious intolerance and even persecution. We were compelled to enter in to a digression on the question of religious tolerance in the Indian subcontinent in order to understand the persecutionist activities and intolerance reflected in the conduct of Māgha, which otherwise would remain a puzzle. Māgha in all probability appears to have been in-

---

[1] Ep. Ind., VII, No. 29, 160 ff; see line 1 of the text.

[2] A.R.E., 419 of 1893; Ep. Ind., VII, p. 167.

fluenced by, if not a follower of, an extremist sect, possibly of the Śaivite faith such as that of Vīraśaivas. It is, however, not possible to arrive at a conclusion on the precise religious affiliations of Māgha in the present state of our knowledge.

As regards the struggle of Parākramabāhu against Māgha, the available information on the course of the war is limited and, as we have shown earlier, the account is given in very general terms. There is no way to track down the military strategy or the plan followed in this campaign for overthrowing Māgha. One of the things to which the king directed his attention before this war with Māgha referred to as the Dravida war in the Pūjāvaliya, was to bring the vanni kings under his control.[1] But it is not stated the vanni kings of which region were thus brought under control, if the reference is to those of Rājaraṭṭha it would have been difficult to interfere with their domains without coming into a direct conflict with Māgha. These vanni chieftains are known to have exercised their authority in different parts of the country such as Rājaraṭṭha and Rohaṇa.[2] In this connection we are told that Pārākramabāhu displayed leniency by reducing the sentence of those comitted to the death penalty to be put in the dungeon under fetters and were to be later set free. The punishment

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIII, 8-10; Pjv., 116.

[2] Cv., LXXXIX, 51; Pjv., 136, 139.

of a prison sentence was commuted to a lighter punishment along with a reprimand. Those who were to be banished from the country were allowed to pay a fine of thousand (kahāpaṇas). 'But on all those who deserved a fine, he looked with indignation and with all sorts words of rebuke he made of them honest men.'[1] We know from the Mahāvaṃsa that the pious king Saṃghabodhi (247-249 A.D.) showed similar compassion, which led him to mete out lighter punishments and the two accounts are very similar.[2]

It is stated that the vanni kings were equipped with 'army and train' (senāvāhansampanna). It may also be noted that they are referred to as Siṃhala maha-vannīn indicating that they were Sinhalese.[3] It is quite probable that these Sinhalese chieftains in Rājaraṭṭha who must have suffered under Māgha's rule, looked upon Parākramabāhu with some respect when the latter became the protector of the Buddhist faith, having taken custody of the sacred objects like the Tooth Relic. But this allegiance of the vanni kings would not have been a matter of course, for there is evidence that they at times proved refractory.[4] We are told that they were 'brought completely under his influence, sitting merely on his lion's throne' having been subjugated by the

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIII, 4-7; Pjv., 116.

[2] Mv., XXXVI, 80-81; Hvv., 20, para.13.

[3] Cv., LXXXIII, 8-10; Pjv., 116.

[4] Pjv., 136 refers to the wives and children of vanni kings previously captured by the Sinhalese king, but returned to them by Vijayabāhu IV.

power of his majesty and by the might of his loving spirit'.[1] It is difficult to believe that the task was as simple as that. The Pūjāvaliya adds a significant detail not found in the Cūlavamsa that, apart from the king's merit, the 'diplomacy' of his younger brother Bhuvanekabāhu, who held the position of yuvarāja, contributed to bring his enemies under control.[2] Like his nephew Vīrabāhu who fought bravely against the Jāvakas, Bhuvanekabāhu appears to have assisted his brother in his efforts to extend his influence into Rājaraṭṭha. What appears to have taken place is not so much a conquest leading to a complete subjugation of the vanni kings, which was difficult and inconceivable in those circumstances, but rather an attempt to win them over to his side through diplomacy and persuasion, a step which is likely to have been of advantage in the ensuing war against the forces of Māgha.

The Pūjāvaliya goes on to state that, having brought the vanni kings under control Parākramabāhu embarked on a Dravida war, namely the campaign against Māgha and Jayabāhu whose forces were garrisoned in the stations referred to earlier.[3] One difficulty that arises at this stage is the date of this war and the defeat of Māgha. In both our principal sources, the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya, the

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIII, 9-10.

[2] ...ekala tamangē ājñā pin balen hā mal yuvarajahugē mantrī belen Lamkāvehi parasaturan sādhannāhu, Pjv., 116.

[3] Pjv., 116; Cv., LXXXIII, 15 ff.

war with and the defeat of Magha are dealt with before the account of the first invasion of Candrabhānu which took place in the eleventh year of the reign of Parakramabāhu (1247).[1] Thus, if the sequence of the narrative reflects a chronological sequence, the defeat of Māgha took place before 1247 A.D.[2] The narratives in the Pūjāvaliya and the Cūlavamsa lend some support to this view for, apart from the fact that the account of Māgha's defeat precedes that of Candrabhānu's invasion, it is specifically stated that Māgha had been defeated and that Parākramabāhu was engaged in developing the country at the time of the Jāvaka invasion in his eleventh year.

> 'After thus accomplishing by his power the crushing of the alien foe, he set himself to bring about the prosperity of all Lankā. When the eleventh year of the reign of the king had arrived, a king of the Jāvakas known by the name of Gandrabhānu landed.....'[3]

The Pūjāvaliya contains the same version.[4]

Paranavitana, on the other hand, would place the defeat of Māgha about the year 1255 A.D. This view is partly based on a subsequent statement occuring in the Pūjāvaliya that the forces of Māgha and Jayabāhu had been in occupation of the strongholds in Rāja-

---

[1] Pjv., 115-18; Cv., LXXXIII, 15-52.

[2] Codrington placed the defeat of Māgha before 1247, C.A.L.R., X, 47.

[3] Cv., LXXXIII, 35-37.

[4] Mesē Lakdiva parasaturan sādhā rata samrddha karavamin siti kalhi nāvata tamanta ekolos vännehi.....Lakdiva nāvata nasannata patangat Candrabhānu nam rajahu hā Jāvaka mahasenga, Pjv. 117.

raṭṭha including Polonnaruva for 40 years before they were finally defeated.[1] This would bring us to the date proposed by Paranavitana. A further argument given by him against placing the event in 1247 is that one cannot understand why Parākramabāhu did not effect his consecration in Polonnaruva or restore that city and place the Tooth Relic in the ancient temple there - the cherished desires of this monarch which were achieved towards the end of his reign only. If Māgha had been defeated as early as 1247 why did Parākramabāhu have to take so long to achieve these objectives when he had a respite of several years before the Pāṇḍya invasions and the second invasion of Candrabhānu. In this intervening period, he has pointed out, Parākramabāhu engaged himself in religious activities in Māyāraṭṭha but did not proceed to Rājaraṭṭha.[2]

These arguments are sufficiently plausible and we are inclined to accept the year 1255 as the approximate date of the defeat of Māgha. But it is necessary to bear in mind certain other considerations, which do not establish this date beyond all doubt. First, it is necessary to grant that the chroniclers disregarded the actual chronological sequence in their narrative, though as shown earlier, it is reasonably clear that Māgha's defeat took place before Candrabhānu's invasion.

---

[1] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 620-21; Pjv., 116.

[2] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 625-26.

It is rather difficult to allow such a lapse to pass in the case of the Pūjāvaliyawhich is an almost contemporary account. Even then this would not be an overwhelming difficultyif we assume that strict chronological considerations were not observed, and that the present discrepancy is a result of placing these political events in a narrative largely devoted to the services rendered to Buddhism. Second, one may explain that Parākramabāhu was unable to perform his consecration in Polonnaruva and attend to activities in that royal capital, because of the possibility that even after the defeat of Māgha, conditions of insecurity continued and that all opposition to his rule had not been completely overcome in Rājarattha, which resulted in the concentration of his activities in Māyārattha. These are, however, not major difficulties. The reference to the occupation of Rājarattha by Māgha for forty years, though the figure is a round number as pointed out by Codrington, and a further statement that these forces had occupied these strongholds for long (katvā katvā balakkāram cirakālam nivāsinam) has to be taken as a favourable argument for Paranavitana's view.[1] The date 1255 in addition fits in well with the sequence of events which will be discussed in the next chapter.

Coming to the account of the campaign against Māgha, we are given

---

[1] C.A.L.R., X, 47; Cv., LXXXIII, 19; Pjv., 116.

no information on the generals who led it or the military strategy they followed. The Cūlavaṃsa states that the Kerala soldiers who were 44,000 in number, 'hard pressed by the spear-armed Sīhala warriors, were unable to resist, came terror-stricken to Pulatthinagara and held counsel there as to their future conduct'.[1] The Pūjāvaliya, which gives almost the same version, states that they resolved:

> 'King Parākramabāhu is of great majesty and meritorious power. Even the kings of foreign lands have come under his influence. All the Sinhalese have rallied round him. A half of us even Dravidas have come under his influence. (We have all become) dim like the fire flies before the (rising) sun, from his abhiṣēka onwards. In the future it is not possible to remain in Siṃhala. Let us not remain, let us go away to (another) country'.[2]

We are told that thereafter they took all their belongings such as horses and elephants, beauties of the harem, precious stones and pearls, royal diadems and other paraphernalia and abandoned the capital.[3] In doing so we are told:

> 'They thought it was the eastern gate and marched out through the western gate and came to Kālavāpi, where the army of the Sīhalas had set up an entrenched camp. With all their goods they had alas! also to sacrifice their life by each giving his to the Sīhala warriors, thus carrying out themselves, what the king had only thought.

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIII, 20-21; Pūjāvaliya, 116 gives the strength of the army as 40,000.

[2] Pjv., 116-17

[3] Cv., LXXXIII, 27-28.

> And all the Sīhalas taking from their accumulated treasures became from that time onwards rich people, as in ancient times all the dwellers in Mithilā who gained the wealth which the kings, a hundred in number had through fear flung away'.[1]

Here, we have only one side of the story. There can be little doubt that the soldiers of Māgha who had remained in occupation of these areas for many years naturally offered resistance to the bitter end. The narrative in all our principal sources gives no indication where such fighting took place, except for the engagement in ambush at Kālavāpi referred to above. It is sufficiently clear that this deficiency is partly due to the desire of the chroniclers to glorify their hero. They were evidently not enthusiastic about any reverses suffered by their hero, or of any bravery and audacity shown by his opponents in battle in this confrontation of the forces of Māgha and Parākramabāhu. The Dambadeṇi Asna, as noted by Paranavitana, takes splendid liberties in its account of these events, when it tries to uphold the personal valour of Parākramabāhu in battle by stating that the Kāliṅga king suffered death at the hands of the forces of the former.[2] The ultimate end which overtook Māgha is nowhere stated in the more authentic sources. We have a reference to a king of 'Sidan' in the Chu-Fän-Chī of Chau Ju Kua written about the year 1225 A.D.[3]

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIII, 29-34; Pjv; 117.

[2] Dmb. A., 31-32; U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 629.

[3] Op.cit., ed. Hirth and Rockhill, 72, 74, 74 note 2, 87-89, 89 note 1.

It states that Silan 細蘭 (Ceylon) was under Nanpi 南毘 (Malabar), a statement which would make sense if we take into account the fact that Māgha was mainly supported by the mercenariss from Malabar in occupation of Rājarattha. If this is the case the identification of the King of 'Silan' with Māgha would gain some confirmation. Unfortunately the king is not mentioned by name. This account hardly adds anything towards solving the present problems, except for a glimpse of life at the court and the impression that the king was in old age.[2]

In any case the authenticity of Chau Ju Kua's account is doubtful for the reasons [illegible] shown elsewhere, and with regard to the final outcome, it is fairly clear that it did not lead to the achievement of any of his major objectives, namely the restoration of the old capital and the shrines in the sacred cities or the performance of his consecration in Pulatthinagara and the restoration of the Tooth Relic to its temple in that city. In other words, it did not lead to any extension into Rājarattha of his active authority. The final defeat of Māgha appears to be linked up with the Pāndya invasions of Ceylon during this period as well as the Jāvaka invasions. These events will be considered in the next chapter.

---

[1] Op.cit., p. 72, 87-89. The editors of this text have pointed out the occupation of Rājarattha by the Kerala mercenaries of Māgha.

[2] See also Nilakanta Sastri, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., VIII, 130 where he points out the unreliability of this work.

Chapter V

The Jāvaka and the Pāndya Invasions

Before we consider the events connected with the final defeat of Māgha it is necessary to draw attention to the invasions of Ceylon by a ruler from the Malay Peninsula - a region with which Ceylon had had no political conflict in the past. The first invasion took place in the eleventh year of the reign of Parākramabāhu. It was led by a king named Candrabhānu who is stated to have invaded the Island with a Jāvaka army. This indeed is the first recorded instance of Ceylon being invaded by a ruler from South East Asia. It is therefore necessary to consider the nature of this invasion in some detail.

The Culavamsa refers to the first of these invasions in these words:

> "When the eleventh year of the reign of this King had arrived, a king of the Jāvakas known by the name of Candrabhānu landed with a terrible Jāvaka army under the treacherous pretext that they were also followers of the Buddha. All these wicked Jāvaka soldiers who invaded every landing place, and who with their poisoned arrows, like to terrible snakes, without ceasing harassed the people whomever they caught sight of, laid waste, raging in their fury all Laṅkā. Just as flashes of lightning with floods of water (visit) a place destroyed by lightning with flames of fire, so Laṅkā which had been harassed by Māgha and others was ravaged anew by the Jāvakas".[1]

These and other passages in the Chronicle relating to Candrabhānu's

---

[1] Cv. LXXXII, 36-39; Pjv., 117.

invasions of Ceylon attracted the attention of scholars from an early date. It was clear to them even at the time they began these investigations that Candrabhānu was a ruler from a part of South East Asia, but opinion differed in regard to the precise land from which he hailed.

After some earlier attempts by several scholars, notably Kern, Bosch, Ferrand and Krom, at the identification of Candrabhāhu and the repercussions of his invasions of Ceylon on the developments in South East Asia, the publication of the text of a Sanskrit inscription from Vat Hva Vian in Jaiya by Coedés in 1918 paved the way for the identification of this ruler.[1]

Coedés reassessed the entire problem in 1927 in the light of a further study of this important inscription. This record, dated Kaliyuga 4332 (1230 A.D.), mentions a ruler named Candrabhānu, who is described as Tāmbralingeśvara belonging to the Padmavaṃsa or Kamalakula, and as lord of the Pañcāṇḍavaṃsa.[3] Coedés pointed out that,

---

[1] For a summary of the views of these scholars see T.B.G., LXXVII, 251-54; 8th All. Ind. Or. Conf., 509, note 1. G. Ferrand, 'L'empire Sumatranais de Çrīvijaya', J.A., XX (1922), 1-104, 161-246, esp. 115, 171 ff., 226; Krom, 'De Ondergang van Çrīvijaya', Med. Kon. Akad. van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Deel 62, series B, No. 5, pp. 151-71; Coedés, 'Le royaume de Çrīvijaya', B.E.F.E.O., XVIII, No. 6 (1918), 1-36, text and translations, 32-33.

[2] 'A propos de la chute du royaume de Çrīvijaya', B.K.I., LXXXIII, (1927), 459-472.

[3] (1) svasti
śrīmatśrīghanasāsanāgrasubhadaṃ yas tāmbraliṅ (2) geśvaraḥ ....
śa..n iva patmavaṃsajanatāṃ vaṃsaprdīpotbhavaḥ

(cont.)

apart from these data which give no indication of Sumatran affiliations, neither Śrīvijaya nor Śailendravaṃśa - the family to which that line of rulers belonged - is mentioned. In addition, he also expressed the view that Tāmbraliṅga, identified with the region of Ligor in the Malay Peninsula, was no longer a dependency of Śrīvijaya and that this ruler was virtually independent of imperial control. Coedés observed:

> 'Mais l'inscription de Jaiyā remet tout en question. En effet si Candrabhānu était souverain du grand royaume sumatranais, il est probable que, suivant l'exemple de celui qui fit graver la stéle Vắt Sema Muong en 775, il aurait mentionné son titre de "Seigneur de Śrīvijaya (Śrīvijeśvara)" au lieu de s'intituler simplement "Seigneur de Tāmbraliṅga". D'autre part, le titre de Śrī Dharmarāja qui ne figure dans aucun document relatif aux rois de Śrīvijaya, semble particulier aux princes régnant sur la région de Ligor. Enfin la dynastie á la quelle se rattache Candrabhānu, la Padmavaṃśa, n'est pas celle des rois de Śrīvijaya qui était, comme l'on sait, le Śailendravaṃśa. Tout concourt á donner l'impression que Candrabhānu était, non le Mahārāja du Zābag, mais un roi gouvernant un état particulier de la Péninsule Malaise, sous la suzeraineté plus ou moins effective de Sumatra'.[1]

(cont.)
samrū (3) pena hi candrabhānumadanah śrīdharmarājā sa yah dharmmaśāsokasamānanī (4) tinipunah pañcan.avaṃśādhipah svasti śrī kamalakulasamutbhr(t)tām (5) braliṅgesvarabhujabalabhimasenākhyāyanas sakalamanusyapunyā (6) nubhāvena babhuva candrasūryyānubhāvam iha lakoprasiddhikīrtti (7) dharacandrabhānu .tiśrīdharmarāja kaliyugabarśāni dvartriṅśādhikas trīni (8) satādhikacatvārasahasrany atikrante śelalekham iva bhaktyāmrta varadam, Recuil des Inscriptions du Siam, II, 27, tr. 28.

---

[1] B.K.I., LXXXIII, 462-63; Recuil des Inscriptions du Siam, II, 25-26.

Coedés thus identified Candrabhānu of the Ceylon Chronicles with the ruler of that name in the Jaiya inscription. In support of this identification he also added that the term Jāvaka could well apply to all Indonesians. The people of Tambraliṅga would well have come under this ethnic denomination, as they differed little from those of Sumatraprior to the influx of the Thais. A further point which strengthened his arguments was the indications in the two sources that both these Candrabhānus were Buddhists.[1] Coedés' identification is now generally accepted.

Paranavitana, who is in agreement with this identification, has, however, recently argued in favour of the earlier view that Candrabhānu was a ruler of Śrīvijaya.[2] We have already considered the difficulties in accepting this view, for Coedés has shown the clear indications for the decline of Śrīvijaya during this period, for which he suggested a date as early as 1178 A.D.[3] These views on the decline of Śrīvijaya are now accepted by most scholars.[4] It is therefore difficult to believe that Candrabhānu in 1247 and again circa 1262-63 was conquering territories for Śrīvijaya; it would rather lend support to the view that he was doing so on his own account. This would indeed

---

[1] Coedés, Les états hindouises d'Indochine et Indonésie, 309-11, Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam, II, 25-26.

[2] J.R.A.S. Cey.Br., NS. VI, pt. I, 1-3.

[3] B.K.I., LXXXIII, 459 ff.

[4] For example see K. N. Sastri, 8th All Ind. Or. Conf. (1935), p.522; Paul Wheatley, The Golden Kersonese (1961), 297-301.

be taken as a clear indication of the decline of Śrīvijaya, as it was no longer able to exercise effective control on the outlying dependencies.

The dating of Candrabhānu's invasions of Ceylon has given rise to a difference of opinion. Coedés initially dated the two invasions in 1236 and 1256 A.D. respectively, partly on the basis of the Jina-kālamālī, a Pali Chronicle of Siam which belongs to the early sixteenth century.[1] Nilakanta Sastri is not inclined to give much credit to this work in dating these events and has shown that Geiger's chronology is in agreement with South Indian chronology.[2] As far as dating the Jāvaka invasions is concerned, Jinakālamālī is not likely to be a reliable guide. This Chronicle informs us that after the lapse of 1800 years from the Parinibbāṇa of the Buddha, or in the Śaka year 718, there reigned in the city of Sukhodaya in Siam a king named Rocarāja. This king, who was keen to see the sea, we are told, worked his way down the river Nān, accompanied by his retinue, and arrived at the city of Siridhamma. There he heard from king Siridhamma the stories of the miraculous image called the Sīhala-paṭimā of the Island of Laṅkā. Rocarāja questioned Siridhamma whether it was possible for others to go there. In reply he was told that the island was protected by the

---

[1] B.K.I., LXXXIII, 462 ff.

[2] 8th All Ind. Conf. 517-19.

deities with miraculous power, namely Sumana, Rāma, Lakkhaṇa (Lakṣamaṇa) and Khattagāma (Kataragama). The two kings sent an envoy to Ceylon to secure the image and Rocarāja returned to his kingdom. After paying homage to this image the Sinhalese king is stated to have handed over the image to the envoy. The ship in which the envoy sailed on his return journey dashed itself on a rock on account of a severe storm, but the image was, however, saved miraculously through divine intervention and was taken to the city of Siridhamma. On hearing the news Rocarāja arrived in that city and took the image away to Sukhodaya where great homage was paid to it.[1]

This in brief is the episode relating to the Sīhala paṭimā in the Jinakālamālī. Now this account undoubtedly bears a reflection of religious relations between the two countries, and that we will take into consideration later. Nilakanta Sastri's distrust of this Siamese Chronicle for purposes of chronology is justified. Firstly, it is clear that the date of Rocarāja given in the Buddha era and the Śaka era yield two different results (544 B.C. as initial year: 1800 B.E. = 1256 A.D; Śaka 718 = 796 A.D.). Secondly there is no reason to believe that the second invasion of Candrabhānu took place in that year of Rocarāja, namely 1800 B.E. (1256 A.D.), for it may well have taken place a few years after this date, which is more in line with the possible date that can be assigned to this event based on Ceylon sources,

---

[1] Jkm. ed. A. P. Buddhadatta, P.T.S., 86-91.

supported also by South Indian (Pāṇḍya) inscriptions as shown by Nilakanta Sastri.[1]

There are other difficulties in accepting the Jinakālamālī version. King Rocarāja cannot be identified in any other sources. According to the story given in this text, when a handsome young man (unnamed) of Gogāma was wandering in a forest, a divine damsel who was taken up by his physical charm desired cohabitation with him, which eventually took place. As a result of this a son was born, who grew up to become a powerful and handsome young man. People who were taken up by these qualities consecrated him as their king and he came to be known as Rocarāja. It is clear from this story that Rocarāja does not figure as a convincing historical figure. Sukhodaya (Sukhotai) arose as a centre of power only after the middle of the century and, before that, it was under Khmer dominion. The story in the Jinakālamālī may be taken as a mere legend explaining the establishment of Theravāda in Thailand, together with local stories about a Sīhala paṭimā.

So far as the first invasion is concerned it is certainly impossible to place it in the year 1236 A.D., for we have shown that this was the date of Parākramabāhu's accession to the throne. The Cūlavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya are unanimous that Candrabhānu's first invastion took place in the eleventh year of the reign of Parākrama-

---

[1] 8th All. Ind. Or. Conf., 508-20; T.B.G., LXXVII, 256-57.

bāhu, and this would bring us to 1247 A.D., the year in which both Nilakanta Sastri and Paranavitana have placed this event.[1] Coedés arrived at those dates partly by a correction of 15 years applied to Wijesinghe's chronology by accepting a suggestion from Jouveau Dubreuil. Coedés, however, revised these dates and placed the two invasions in 1247 and 1270. It will be shown in the sequel that the second invasion took place a few years earlier than 1270.[2] The main arguments of Coedés in regard to the identification of Candrabhānu and hisdating of the decline of Śrīvijaya are generally accepted.

On the whole, Ceylon's relations with Indonesian territories appear to have been peaceful. Paranavitana has collected and examined data from Pali and Sinhalese literature bearing on this subject.[3] From about the 12th century onwards the Sīhala-Saṃgha played a prominent role in the religious developments of Siam and Camboja, apart from Burma.[4]

An important fragmentary inscription from the Ratubaka Plateau in Central Java would take Ceylon's religious relations with that island to at least the end of the eighth century A.D.[5] De Casparis has

---

[1] 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 520, U.C.H.C., I, pt, II, 620-21.

[2] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXII, 190-213.

[3] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VII, pt. I, 4-6, 18-23.

[4] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXII, 190-213.

[5] J. G. de Casparis, 'New Evidence on the Cultural relations between Java and Ceylon in ancient times', Artibus Asiae, XXIV, 241-48.

drawn attention to this interesting record, in the light of which he has suggested rightly that Ceylon too played a part in the 'Indianisation' of South East Asia. This inscription states that 'This Abhayagiri Vihāra here of the Sinhalese ascetics (?) trained in the sayings of discipline of the Best of the Jinas was established'.[1] Commenting on this record he observes:

> 'The most important detail is the name of the foundation, viz. the Abhayagiri Vihāra. The name at once suggests that of the famous monastery at Anurādhapura and the addition "of the Sinhalese" proves that this is not just a coincidence. In fact the foundation is a second Abhayagiri Vihāra: either a more or less exact replica of the Ceylonese monastery or, more probably, a building which had enough with it - in form or spirit or both - to deserve the same name. Further excavations on the Ratubaka plateau may yield materials capable of giving an impression of this interesting building. In the present stage of research there is, however, one important conclusion that may be safely drawn from the inscription: the existence of cultural relations between Java and Ceylon in the Śailendra period'.[2]

It is interesting to note in the light of this epigraph that Ceylon's relations with South East Asia go back to an early date. It is also significant that the more 'liberal' monastery - the Abhayagiri Vihāra - which was receptive to external influences, touching at times even matters of doctrine, had become a source of inspiration to their co-religionists in that part of Asia.

Such evidence as is forthcoming from the presentrecord would indicate the possibility that Ceylon had similar relations with the

---

[1] J. G. de Casparis, 'New Evidence on the Cultural relations between Java and Ceylon in ancient times', Artibus Asiae, XXIV, 245.

[2] J. G. de Casparis, 'New Evidence on the Cultural relations between Java and Ceylon in ancient times', Artibus Asiae, XXIV, 245.

neighbouring lands like the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra, too. As far as the Malay Peninsula is concerned, if Paranavitana's identification of Tambarattha with Tāmbralinga is accepted, it has to be conceded that the two countries had similar cultural reations in the 12th and 13th centuries. We have shown some difficulties in endorsing this identification but it must be admitted that both the Pūjāvaliya and the Daladāsirita state that Dhammakitti thera, who was invited to Ceylon by Parākramabāhu II, came from Tamalimgamu, in place of Tambarattha of the Cūlavamsa which refers to this episode.[1] Tamalimgamu has a strong resemblance to Tambaliṅga-visaya of the Hatthavanagallavihāravamsa, from where Candrabhānu invaded Ceylon, according to this text. This would point in favour of Paranavitana's identification, as we have shown elsewhere, but in the light of the difficulties pointed out by us this must remain an open question in the present state of our knowledge.[2]

In the account of the first invasion of Candrabhānu no reason is given why he invaded Ceylon[3]. In connection with the second, however, we are told that he demanded from Parākramabāhu the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl as well as his kingdom.[4] We may also take note of

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIV, 11 ff; Pjv., 118; Dal.S. 44,

[2] Hvv., 32; Nilakanta Sastri criticised this identification recently, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br. NS. VIII (1962), 125-27.

[3] Cv., LXXXIII, 36 ff.

[4] Cv., LXXXVIII, 62 ff.

the story of the Sīhala-paṭimā in the Jinakālamālī though, as shown above, it is very doubtful whether it has any direct bearing on these events.[1] In addition, the Culavaṃsa states that Candrabhānu and his Jāvaka army landed 'under the pretext that they were also followers of the Buddha'.[2] Though the chronicler had been reluctant to grant that he was a Buddhist for understandable reasons, these accounts and the Jaiyā Inscription would leave no doubt that Candrabhānu was a Buddhist. The story of the Sīhala-paṭimā and the reference to the Tooth Relic and the Bowl Relic in the account of the second invasion may indicate that the desire to gain possession of these sacred objects was at least one important consideration, which motivated him to undertake this hazardous expedition. This, however, would not rule out the possibility of Candrabhānu's territorial ambitions in Ceylon for which there is some indication in the account of the second invasion.[3] But that religious considerations were involved in these invasions appears almost beyond doubt. From the discussion which follows it would appear that, if he was moved by the desire to gain possession of sacred objects at first, later he saw the chances of territorial success in Ceylon and ventured to achieve that objective.

If Candrabhānu had merely planned to carve out for himself a

---

[1] Jkm., 86-91.

[2] 'mayaṃ pi sogatā eva iti māyaṃ vidhaya so', Cv., LXXXIII, 37.

[3] Hvv., 32; Cv., LXXXVIII, 62 ff.

kingdom in Ceylon by this expedition across the seas to an island where he had no previous political experience, it is difficult to understand why he should not have diverted his energy and resources to more rewarding ventures closer home. The fact that he could find the men and resources for these costly expeditions shows that he disposed of considerable power, though not comparable with that of Śrīvijaya in earlier times. In fact Candrabhānu could try his fortune closer home in view of the weakening of the authority of Śrīvijaya on the out-lying dependencies. The first expedition thus appears to have been partly motivated by religious considerations, though we cannot be certain of this. However, it is probable that the experience he gained in his trial of strength with the forces of Parākramabāhu on this occasion, in which, however, the chroniclers would have us believe that Candrabhānu was defeated, kindled in him hopes of success in the future. And this he undertook some years later.

Owing to lack of information, however, it is impossible to be certain of Candrabhānu's motives. It is possible to suggest that Candrabhānu had heard of Ceylon, especially of the time of Parākramabāhu I when he invaded South India and also chastised the ruler of Burma. Candrabhānu may have associated the fame of Parākramabāhu with the possession of certain sacred relics. He may have tried to obtain these relics by negotiations but was unsuccessful. When he heard of the difficulties in Ceylon, possibly arising from the occupation of Rājaraṭṭha by Māgha, perhaps he ventured on this expedition. An inscription from Siam, which

however belongs to a later date than that of these events, mentions a Siamese prince who went to the kingdoms of Kaliṅga, Paṭaliputra, Coḷamaṇḍala, the kingdom of the Mallas and to the Island of Laṅkā in search of precious relics.[1] It is not impossible that Candrabhānu, being a Buddhist himself, similarly had in ideas of possessing the coveted relics such as the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl, which were now in the possession of Parākramabāhu II. It appears that religious motives were at least partly responsible for this venture, whatever course it may have taken later.

Prince Vīrabāhu, sister's son of Parākramabāhu, was sent out to fight the Jāvaka invader when he landed in Ceylon for the first time.[2] The Jāvaka soldiers are described as having been equipped with poisoned arrows 'which were shot one after the other by the Jāvaka soldiers from a machine'.[3] Geiger has pointed out that such mechanical devices from which stones were hurled were known in mediaeval warfare.[4] Poisoned arrows, however, do not appear to have been used as a weapon in warfare in Ceylon at any time, but the Pali Chronicle mentions that they were in use among the Rāmaññas apart from the Jāvakas.[5] Archery, how-

---

[1] Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam, I, 145-49.

[2] Cv., LXXXIII, 42-43; Pjv. does not mention the role of Vīrabāhu in this battle, see 117-18; Rjv., 45, mentions Parākramabāhu's brother (Bhuvanekabāhu) in place of Virabāhu.

[3] 'yuddhe Jāvakayodhehi yantamutte lahum lahum visadiddhamukhe bāṇe bahdhā'bhimukhagate', Cv., LXXXIII, 44.

[4] Cv. Tr. II, 152, note 1.

[5] Cv., LXXVI, 46 ff; Codrington, C.H.J., IV, 159; Geiger, Cult. Cey. Med. Times, 156.

ever, was certainly a highly specialised art practised in families where its skill remained a hereditary speciality. The archers formed an important element in the Sinhalese army.[1] Unfortunately, the Cūlavaṃsa does not state where the fighting took place but only says that the Jāvakas landed 'in every landing place'. Generally invaders in the past landed in the port of Mahātittha (Mantai) in the north western coast. There were occasions when they landed in the port of Sūkaratittha (Kayts) in the extreme north of Ceylon, and at Goṇa (Trincomalee) on the north eastern coast.[2] This does not exclude the possibility that he landed in a southern or south western port.

It has indeed been concluded that he would have landed on the south western coast of Ceylon and that the fighting might have taken place in that region. This suggestion is based on the statement in the Cūlavaṃsa that when Vīrabāhu was victorious in battle in this war he went to Devanagara to worship the 'lotus-hued' god there before he returned to Jambuddoṇi.[3] This, however, need not necessarily be a correct inference for, as this god and his shrine were held in such veneration as to deserve thanksgiving after victory, Vīrabāhu could have done so even if the fighting had taken place far from this southern shrine.

---

[1] Mv., XXIII, 85-89; Cult. Cey. Med. Times, 156.

[2] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VI, 76-80, 84; Ep. Zeyl., V., No. 14, 170-73.

[3] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 622-23; Cv., LXXXIII, 48-50.

Although there is no conclusive evidence in favour of the above suggestion, it must be noted that Candrabhānu's invasion was from a new quarter, namely South East Asia. It is therefore not necessary to assume that he would have landed in a northern port as South Indian invaders had done. Besides, Rajaraṭṭha was at this time under Māgha's occupation, and he may have had to enter into a conflict with him, too, in case he landed in a northern port. And if Candrabhānu's desire at this time was to obtain the sacred relics, which evidently were in the possession of Parakramabahu who ruled in South Western Ceylon, there was no need to come into conflict with Māgha, who ruled in Rajaraṭṭha. Thus, though there is the possibility that Candrabhānu might have landed in the southern or south western coast of the island, it cannot be established beyond doubt.

The Cūlavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya clearly state that Candrabhānu and his Jāvakas were defeated.[1] The heroism of Virabāhu is brought out in language couched in poetic flourishes: 'Going forth to combat like Rāma, Prince Vīrabāhu slew numbers of Jāvakas as Rāma (slew) Rakkhasas. The Veramba wind namely Vīrabāhu possessed of great vehemence shattered again and again the forest wilderness namely the Jāvaka foes'.[2] There can be little doubt that Candrabhānu and the Jāvakas suffered defeat at the hands of Vīrabāhu. We are told that 'After thus putting to flight the Jāvakas in combat he freed the whole region of

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIII, 42-48; Pjv., 117-18.

[2] Cv., LXXXIII, 46-47. Here Geiger has pointed out the influence of Sanskrit poetics, Cv. Tr., II, 151, note 4.

Laṅka from the foe'.[1]

We can raise an interesting question at this stage. After the defeat did Candrabhānu return to his own kingdom with his Jāvakas? The Chronicles do not make such a statement but we are told that the Jāvakas were put to flight. There is a possibility that the defeated Jāvakas did not abandon the island but remained behind in the north of Ceylon towards the Jaffna Peninsula forming a Jāvaka settlement, which later became the nucleus of a 'Jāvaka kingdom'. Codrington and, afterwards, Paranavitana, have called attention to some place names still current in that region, such as Chāvākachchērī ('the Jāvaka quarter'), Chāvankōṭṭai ('Jāvaka fort') at Nāvatkuli in the Jaffna Peninsula, and Jāvaka-kōṭṭai ('Jāvaka fort') on the mainland remind us of the association of this region with the Jāvakas.[2] It may be argued that these place names could date from a period posterior to these events with which we are presently concerned. But the word 'kōṭṭai' 'kōṭṭe' associated with these place names is significant and provides the indication that they were places of military occupation. in origin.[3] That these place names are not of recent origin and

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIII, 48.

[2] Codrington, SHC., 78; Paranavitana, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VII, 194-95;

[3] The Dutch and the British imported Javanese labour, but the occurence of some of these names in the Kaḍaimpot (Boundary Books) which belong to about the fourteenth century may further suggest that they were of not recent origin, Paranavitana, op.cit., 1945.

that at least some of them were places of military occupation is confirmed by the fifteenth century Sinhalese poem Kōkilasandesaya. An interesting verse in this poem cited by Medhaṅkara Thera refers to Sapumal Kumāraya who occupied the Jaffna Peninsula (Yāpāpaṭuna) for Parākramabāhu VI. The author calls upon his messenger - the Kōkila - to have a look at the Jāvaka-Kōṭṭaya where Sapumal Kumāraya defeated the Kanarese forces (Kannaḍi-sen). Therefore, it is clear that Jāvaka-kōṭṭe, like several other place names cited here, is not of recent origin.[1]

These data obtain a particular significance in the light of the information contained in a few Pāṇḍya inscriptions of this period from South India to be considered in the sequel. In the light of these important records from South India, it appears to be a certainty that the Jāvakas ruled over a part of northern Ceylon for some time. The accounts of Candrabhānu's invasions in the Chronicles establish that he was defeated on both occasions, and the impression created is that they were merely sporadic invasions which were repulsed successfully. They do not refer to or imply a Jāvaka occupation of part of the island during a period. This is an important and interesting difference

---

[1] 'sēvaka samaṅga Pärakum niriṅduge vipula
ēvaka pämini Sapumal kumariṅdu pabala
nēvaka gunäti Kannaḍi sen biṅdi tumula
Jāvaka-kōṭṭaya däka yan maṅga asala'
Kokila Sandeśaya, verse No.240 cited by Medhaṅkara in his edition of Pūjāvaliya, Ch. XXXIV, p.72.

emerging from a comparative study of the Ceylon Chronicles and the South Indian inscriptions, which we propose to take up presently.

A number of inscriptions dated in the reigns of Jaṭāvaman Sundara Pāṇḍya (accession 1251 A.D.) and Jaṭāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya (accession 1253 A.D.) have brought to light interesting data on an aspect of Ceylon history during this period, where Ceylon sources have maintained an understandable silence. They refer to the invasion of Ceylon by these Pāṇḍya kings during the reign of Parākramabāhu II. In order to understand these events in their perspective it is necessary to note briefly the political developments in South India during this period.

Throughout the first half of the thirteenth century the power of the Colas was declining and their place came gradually to be taken by the Pāṇḍyas. Kulottunga III made a desperate attempt to hold together a crumbling empire amidst great odds, but the forces of disintegration moved on.[1] The disintegration had virtually reached the point of no return when the Kāḍava chieftain Kopperuñjiṅga succeeded in taking the Cola 'emperor' prisoner, about the year 1230 A.D. The situation was temporarily saved by the intervention of the Hoysala king Vīranarasiṃha, who released the Cola king, claiming for himself the title 'The Defender of the Cola Monarchy' (Colarājya (maṇḍala) pratiṣṭhācārya).[2] Thus the Colas were practically reduced to insig-

---

[1] The Colas, 365 ff; The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, 118-37.

[2] The Colas, 422-23; Ep. Ind., VII, 162.

nificance in South India.

In this situation the Pāṇḍyas who, for centuries, had felt the impact of Cola imperialism through the repeated invasions of their country, emerged the predominant power in South India. With Sundara Pāṇḍya we see the reverse of the process when he successfully carried the war into the heart of the Cola country.[1] It was, however, with the accession of Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya about the year 1251 A.D. that the second Pāṇḍya empire reached its high watermark and remained in that position throughout the thirteenth century, as testified to by numerous inscriptions and the accounts of Muslim writers.[2] Sundara Pāṇḍya was ably assisted by Jaṭāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya, who ascended the throne about the year 1253-54 A.D. and ruled contemporaneously with him. During their rule Pāṇḍya supremacy was established over a considerable part of South India. The Kēraḷa kingdom was invaded and made tributary while the power of the Hoysalas was confined to their home territory. The Koṅgu country became subject to Pāṇḍya supremacy. Nilakanta Sastri has discussed the more important inscriptions of these rulers in The Pāṇḍya Kingdom and has shown the extent of the territory in which their supremacy held sway.[3]

---

[1] The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, 138-46.

[2] The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, 156-73, Ch. XII, 174 ff.

[3] The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, 174-87.

It is but natural that these developments in South India were to have an impact on the course of events in Ceylon. In the past dynasties which gained supremacy in South India included Ceylon in their orbit of territorial expansion, as shown by the Colas who invaded Ceylon towards the end of the tenth century and ruled over Rājarattha for a period of about half a century.[1] The Pāṇḍyas of the second empire seem to have attempted to extend their influence into Ceylon. Several records belonging to the reign of Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya and Jaṭāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya refer to victories over Ceylon, showing clearly that these rulers attempted the extension of their influence to the neighbouring island. These records are important for the course of Ceylon history during this period, as they throw light on an aspect not dealt with in the Pali Chronicles.

These records pose important problems. In the reconstruction of Pāṇḍya history, Nilakanta Sastri referred to many such obstacles, such as the interpretation of astronomical data in the inscriptions for purposes of chronology.[2] Although the records give both the regnal years of the kings and astronomical data their dates cannot often be established satisfactorily. This led Nilakanta Sastri to remark that:

> 'These astronomical details yield different results in the hands of different scholars and often in the hands of the same scholar at different times. New kings have

---

[1] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 411-27. For the invasions of Ceylon by the kings of the first Pāṇḍya empire, see U.C.H.C., I, pt. I, 326-8; see also K. N. Sastri, 15th All Ind. Or. Conf. (1949), 294-97.

[2] The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, 139-41; A.R.E., 1926-27, p. 92, para. 45.

> been postulated and given up in a manner that has tended to make the chronology a game of nine pins. As one wades through the results of Kielhorn, Jacobi, Swami Kannu Pillai and Sewell one almost gets the feeling that ignorance, at least of astronomy is bliss....'[1]

Fortunately, the records concerning the events in Ceylon contain dates which yield results which appear beyond doubt. This holds true so far as the dates are concerned, but that would not relieve us of the problems of chronology arising from our attempts to understand the events referred to therein, as may appear from the present discussion.

The prasastis of Sundara Pāṇḍya from his seventh regnal year (1258 A.D) onwards state that he levied a tribute of elephants and precious jewels from the king of Ceylon.[2] In an inscription of this ruler at the Jambukeśvara temple at Śrīraṅgam, Trichinopoly, which recounts his numerous victories, Sundara Pāṇḍya is referred to as 'a second Rama in plundering the Island of Laṅkā' (Laṅkādvīpa-luṇṭana-dvitīya-Rāma).[3]

There are records dated in the reign of Vīra Pāṇḍya which contain more data on an expedition to Ceylon. In an inscription of the tenth regnal year (A.D. 1263), we are told that 'in the tenth year

---

[1] The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, 140.

[2] 'Tulaṅgoḷi maṇiyuñ-jūḷi vēḷamuṁ Īḷaṅgai kāvalanai-yīṛai koṇḍaruḷi', 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 508; T.B.G., LXXVII, 254; K. N. Śāstri, The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, 162 note 3 pointed out that K. V. S. Aiyar was wrong in his view that Sundara Pāṇḍya refused to accept the tribute and seized him. Ancient Dekhan 166.

[3] Ind. Ant., XXI, E. Hultzch, 121-22.

of king Jaṭāvarman alias Tribhuvanacakravarti Śrī Vīra Pāṇḍydeva who was pleased to take Śonāḍu, Īḷam and Śāvagan's crown together with the crowned head'.[1] More information is forthcoming from a long prasasti the full text of which is available in one copy from Kuḍumiyamalai.[2] Inscriptions of Vira Pāṇḍya are known to cover almost every regnal year up to this point but, in thenotes on their contents published in the Annual Report on Epigraphy and in other relevant publications, no reference is made to those details concerning Ceylon until his tenth year.[3] It may be noted that a record of his ninth year from Śēndamaṅgalam, too, does not contain these data pertaining to the Ceylon expedition.[4] Vira Pāṇḍya's inscriptions after this date also make repeated mention of victories over Ceylon, but they provide us with no new information on these events.[5] The Kuḍumiyāmalai text is corrupt and it is sometimes difficult to make out implications of its contents at several points as shown by Nilakanta Sastri, who has drawn attention to its salient features in his edition of the text.[6]

---

[1] 'Svasti, śrī Kōccaḍaiya-panmarāna tripuvanac-cakravattigaḷ Śōnāḍum Īḷamum Śāvakan muḍiyum muḍittalaiyuṅ-goṇḍaruḷiya śrī Vira Pāṇḍya devarkku yandu 10 - vadu', A.R.E., No. 588 of 1916. For early speculation on the Śāvakan see A.R.E., 1917, p.111, para. 11. Text cited by K. N. Sastri in 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 509, and in T.B.G.,, LXXVII, 255, note 2; see also A.R E, No. 421 of 1907.

[2] A.R.E., No. 356 of 1906; K. N. Sastri gives the text and an abstract of its contents in T.B.G., LXXVII, 265-68, 8th All Ind. Or. Conf. 523-26, and in his History of Śrīvijaya , 133-34; see also Inscriptions of the Puḍukoṭṭah State, No. 366, 238-39.

[3] A.R.E., No. 432 of 1917, 3rd year. See also A.R.E., 1918, p. 155, para. 48; 299 of 1919, 8 and 9 of 1928-29, 4th year; 468 of 1907, 25 of 1928-

(cont.)

A minister (mandiri) of Ceylon is mentioned who appears to have sought the aid of the Pāṇḍya king (.....tirunda mandiri saranamai etc.), which in the context has to be taken as a step to settle a dispute between two kings of Ceylon. It is also stated that the (Pāṇḍya) King's aim was 'to uphold in proper form the ancient practice of royalty' (arasiyal vaḻakkam neṟippaḍu nāṭṭuṅguṟippinuḷ). Then we are told that among the (two)kings of Ceylon one was killed in the battle field[1] and all his troops, treasures and royal paraphenalia were seized, the double carp (the Pāṇḍya crest) was put upon the fine flags which were waving on the Koṇamalai and the Trikūṭagiri and that another king (ēnai vēndan) of Ceylon was compelled to surrender his elephants as tribute.[2] And the son of the Śāvakan, who formerly disregarded the commands and showed hostility, came and prostrated himself before Vīra Pāṇḍya and was duly rewarded. In the difficult portion of the text at this point, Nilakanta Sastri makes out that the son of the Śāvakan (Śāvakan maindan) was presented with the

---

3(cont.) 29, 5th year; 1928-29, p.70, para. 15.

4A.R.E., 480 of 1930.

5For example, A.R.E. 437 of 1917, 544 of 1911 of the 14th, 15th and 16th years respectively, 1912, p.71, para. 37, 197 of 1932-33, p. 69, para 34.

6 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511-12.

1 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511; T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophes 7-8.

2 T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophes 9-11.

anklet of heroes (vīrakkaḷal), taken round in procession on an elephant and was at once permitted to proceed to Anurāpurī, because it was thought by Vīra Pāṇḍya that it was only proper that the son should rule the vast land of Ceylon (formerly) ruled by his father.[1]

As early as 1922 Ferrand stressed the importance of a comparative study of South Indian inscriptions in relation to the problem of Candrabhānu.[2] Later on it became clear that the Śāvaka of the South Indian inscriptions had a bearing on the Jāvaka invasions referred to in the Ceylon Chronicles. In 1929 Nilakanta Sastri took note of these records in The Pāṇḍya Kingdom and referred to the Pāṇḍya invasions of Ceylon during this period.[3] A few years later he attempted a more detailed treatment of these events in two important papers,[4] in which he tried to understand the course of events by placing them in a chronological sequence. He suggested certain modifications, but accepted the main arguments of Coedés on the identification of Candrabhānu and the dating of the decline of Śrīvijaya. While these articles marked a great advance in our understanding of these confused events, the nature of the South Indian records, with their great difficulties, left

---

[1] T.B.G., 267, strophes 11-12; 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511-12.

[2] J.A. (1922), p. 163; Coedés referred to Vīra Pāṇḍya's inscriptions in which the Śāvakan figures, B.K.I., LXXXIII (1927) 465.

[3] Op.cit., 175-77.

[4] 'The Ceylon Expedition of Jaṭāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya', 8th All Ind. Or. Conf. 1935, 508-26; 'Śrīvijaya, Candrabhānu and Vīra Pāṇḍya', T.B.G., LXXVII, (1937) 251-68.

some of the problems open.

Several interesting questions can be raised in the light of the data from the Pāṇḍya inscriptions. Do the inscriptions of Sundara Pāṇḍya and those of Vira Pāṇḍya refer to one or to two different expeditions against Ceylon? Who was the minister who sought the aid of the Pāṇḍya king? Did Parākramabahu II strike an alliance with the Pāṇḍya rulers in order to expel the invaders who were in occupation of Rājarattha? Who were the (two) kings, one of whom was killed in the battle field and forfeited his possessions? And who was the 'other king' forced to surrender his elephants as tribute? Who was 'the son of Sāvakan' restored to his father's kingdom? It would be difficult to answer many of these questions with the desirable degree of precision but an attempt will be made to explain them as far as possible subject, however, to the limitations arising from the very nature of these records.

One observation that can be safely made is that the records of Vīra Pāṇḍya refer to the expedition not only in greater detail but with much greater emphasis. Sundara Pāṇḍya's inscriptions merely refer to the exaction of elephants and precious jewels as tribute from the king of Ceylon, apart from the stylised phrase stating that he was 'a second Rāma in plundering the island of Laṅkā'. These claims are made in the inscriptions beginning from the seventh year of the reign of Sundara Pāṇḍya (1258), while the first mention of the victories of Vīra Pāṇḍya over Ceylon occurs in the tenth year, i.e. 1263, elaborated in greater detail

in the Kuḍumiyāmalai prasasti of the eleventh year, i.e. 1264. It may also be noted that the Sāvaka does not figure at all in the inscriptions of Sundara Pāṇḍya. A further point to bear in mind is that there is a gap of at least five years which separates the earliest records of the two Pāṇḍya kings in their references to victories over Ceylon. In the light of these circumstances it is reasonable to hold that some time before, or about, the year 1258 Sundara Pāṇḍya succeeded in chastising the king of Ceylon. He wa s perhaps satisfied with the exaction of tribute and an acknowledgment of his supremacy. As it is generally believed that Vīra Pāṇḍya assisted Sundara Pāṇḍya in his conquests it is not unlikely that Vīra Pāṇḍya was associated in some way in this expedition. But Sundara Pāṇḍya rather than the latter, appears to have figured prominently in this invasion of Ceylon.

The more detailed information on Vīra Pāṇḍy's expedition in the Kuḍumiyāmalai prasasti as well as the differences in the two accounts create the impression that this ruler played a more prominent role in a subsequent expedition, which appears to have taken place between 1258 and 1263. It may be inferred that the latter resulted in a more active intervention of the Pāṇḍyas in the affairs of Ceylon, and was perhaps a continuation of what Sundara Pāṇḍya initiated some time before his seventh year. If the inscriptions of the two kings refer to one and the same expedition organised jointly, which Nilakanta Sastri has ruled out on good reasons, it is difficult to explain why Sundara Pāṇḍya makes

only a passing mention of it in contrast to Vīra Pāṇḍya. Besides, as stated earlier, the nature of the claims by the two rulers in regard to their victories over Ceylon are different.[1] At any rate we may not be far from the truth if we infer that it was really the expedition of Vīra Pāṇḍya that led to a more active intervention in its affairs. It need not be imagined that Vira Pāṇḍya was conducting expeditions on his own as against Sundara Pāṇḍya. Rather, the latter's sympathies were on his side in these ventures which were after all an extension of the supremacy of the Pāṇḍyas. There cannot be much doubt that Vīra Pāṇḍya was the principal figure in this expedition, for it is extremely unlikely that he would have detailed the victories in this manner and claimed the credit for himself in one of his records if it was really a joint enterprise. We may now proceed to analyse the contents of Vīra Pāṇḍya's prasasti and see how far they could be reconciled with the events in Ceylon as known from the Ceylon sources.

The record begins with high-sounding claims to numerous victories over far flung territories both within and outside the Indian subcontinent. The passage quoted below would show that Nilakanta Sastri had ample justification for regarding most of these high sounding claims as 'court poetry, not history':[2]

> 'Gaṅgam, Gauḍam, Kaḍāram, Kāsipam, Koṅgam, Kudiram, Kōsalam, Māḷuvam, Arumaṇam, Sonagam, Cīnam, Avanti, Karunaḍam, Īḻam, Kaliṅgam, Teliṅgam, Papanam(?), Daṇḍakam (or Daṇḍanam), and Paṇḍaram - the kings of

---

[1] 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 508-12.

[2] 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511.

> all these and other lands and the strong mandalīkas, having entered the victorious gate of the palace in the jewelled mansion, in which the three drums reverberated, awaited the convenience (of Vīra Pāṇḍya), made obeisance at his feet and presented before him the dark elephants and the treasure they had brought as a tribute.[1]

According to these claims Vīra Pāṇḍya would have overrun practically the entire subcontinent of India and even such distant foreign lands like China (Cīnam), Kaḍāram in the Malay Peninsula and Burma (Arumaṇam). Much of this is stylised praśasti and apparently rests on no historical foundation.

But the same cannot be said of his claims of victories over Ceylon. Here too the narrative is garbed in the characteristic praśasti language, but the description of the victories clearly indicates that it was more than a boastful claim. The reference to the death of one of the kings of Ceylon and the capture of his royal paraphernalia and the restoration of the son of the Sāvakan to his kingdom have to be taken as claims based on some foundation, and therefore deserve careful investigation.

At this stage it is necessary to consider the view expressed by Paranavitana that Parākramabāhu II sought the aid of the Pāṇḍyas in his struggle against his enemies who occupied Rājarattha, namely Māgha and his Kerala mercenaries.[2] In other words he has opined that Pāra-

---

[1] T.B.G., LXXVII, 265-66, strophes 1-4; 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., see translation of this passage, 510-11.

[2] Dambadeni Sāhitya Sammēlanaya Saṭahan, (1959), 27-30, text of speech delivered on the Sāhitya day, 1958 at Dambadeniya; U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 618-28.

kramabāhu and the Pāṇḍyas were in alliance and that the latter's invasions of the north of Ceylon, coupled with the simultaneous attacks by Parākramabāhu from the south resulted in the final defeat of Māgha. Circumstantial evidence seems to point in favour of this view, though it lacks direct evidence for confirmation.

We have already noted the unconvincing tone of the account in the Cūlavaṃsa when it deals with the campaign of Parākramabāhu against Māgha. This account, as pointed out by Paranavitana, is conspicuous by the absence of any reference to the generals who planned and led it or the military strategy followed by them.[1] The efforts at eulogy on the part of the chronicler only bring this weakness into more prominent relief. The passage cited by Paranavitana is by far the best illustration of this point:

> 'King Parākramabāhu is of high majesty and is of miraculous power. Who in the world is strong enough to neglect his commands? Even the monarchs of foreign lands have now come under his influence, also all the Sīhalas. Even some of us Damilas are his followers. What is the use of words about others? But what, what shall we people do? Now we have all become dim like glow-worms at the rising of the radiant sun. Therefore in the future, it is impossible for us to take up our abode on the Sīhala Island, we will go to another country.'[2]

We are told that these Damilas and Keralas were unable to resist 'the spear-armed Sīhala warriors' and therefore withdrew to Pulatthinagara

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIII, 1-35; U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 619-20.

[2] Cv., LXXXIII, 22-26.

and gave vent to the sentiments referred to above.[1] Paranavitana raises the question why these men who had their strongholds in the coastal regions of Northern Ceylon flocked to Pulatthinagara in the hour of imminent defeat, instead of leaving Ceylon from those ports if they wanted to do so. Further he adds that it is unlikely that Parākramabāhu could attack these northern coastal strongholds without a fleet, for the existence of which there is no evidence.[2]

In the continuatinn of the narrative we are told that the Damilas took their elephants and horses, pearls and precious stones and other royal paraphenalia and made their escape, in the course of which they mistakenly marched out through the western gate thinking that it was the eastern gate and, consequently, at Kālavāpi they were attacked and routed by the Sīhalas who had pitched their camp there.[3] Paranavitana thinks that the implication of this statement is that they escaped through the western gate because of the approach of an enemy both from the north and the east, but were taken unawares by the Sīhala soldiers who remained at Kālavāpi for their turn, to attack the fleeing forces of Māgha. The enemy from the north and the east, whose advance is said to have led to this retreat of the forces of Māgha is identified with the Pāndyas, who invaded Ceylon some time before 1258, as known from

---

[1] Cv, LXXXIII, 20-21; Pjv., 116-17.

[2] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 619-20.

[3] Cv., LXXXIII, 27-35; Pjv., 117.

Sundara Pāṇḍya's inscriptions.[1]

Now, with regard to the withdrawal of Māgha's forces finally to Pulatthinagara from their northern strongholds it is possible that the threat of the Pāṇḍya invasion made it necessary for them to take this course of action. On the other hand, it is also understandable if the pressure of Parākramabāhu's forces from the south, which had advanced at least up to Kālavāpī to the west of Polonnaruva, made it necessary for their garrisons to be released for the defence of the capital city in which Māgha himself was resident.[2] The possibility that the threat of a foreign invasion, which indeed Māgha was prepared to meet if the location of his strongholds mainly in the northern coastal positions is in indication, led to their abandonment, can be conceded. Further as the defeat of Māgha took place about the year 1255 there is some reason to believe that it was in some way connected with the Pāṇḍya invasion dated some time before 1258. This invasion, organised by a powerful sovereign such as Sundara Pāṇḍya, is likely to have weakened the position of Māgha, and Parākramabāhu possibly took advantage of it, whether the Pāṇḍya invasion was undertaken in collaboration with the Sinhalese king or not.

According to the Cūlavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya Māgha was decisively defeated and all his treasures and all the inmates of the harem were

---

[1] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 620-21.

[2] Cv., LXXX, 73-74. Note the Rjv. statement: 'Polonnaruvē udaviyaṭa Urāṭoṭin udavvaṭa avut un Demaḷa senaga'; 'the Tamils who had come from Urāṭoṭa (Kayts) to assist (their) men in Polonnaru', Rjv., 45.

seized.[1] The plunder of the defeated forces brought such enormous booty that we are told: 'And all the Sīhalas taking from them their accumulated treasures, became from this time onward rich people, as in ancient times all the dwellers in Mithilā who gained the wealth, which the kings a hundred in number, had through fear flung away'.[2] This is undoubtedly exaggerated, but there is no doubt that Māgha suffered a defeat. It is difficult to imagine that Parākramabāhu should have sufficient resources at this stage to undertake a successful campaign against Māgha who was powerfully entrenched in a number of strongholds. This would point strongly in favour of the view that the Sinhalese king had some kind of understanding with the Pāṇḍyas during this period. This does not necessarily imply that Parākramabāhu should have refused to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pāṇḍya king. In fact the king of Ceylon (Iḷaṅgai Kāvaḷan), who paid a tribute of elephants and precious jewels to Sundara Pāṇḍya, was in all probability Parākramabāhu himself.[3] These relations between the Sinhalese and the Pāṇḍya kings would have inevitably led to the exchange of envoys and courtesies between the two countries. The Pali Chronicles, which eulogise the reign of Parākramabāhu, could state with some justification that 'Even the monarchs of foreign lands have now come under

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIII, 30-34; Pjv., 117.

[2] Cv., LXXXIII, 33-34.

[3] A.R.E., 166 of 1894; 8th All Ind. Or. Conf. 508.

his influence' and 'the heroes of the Pandus and the Colas, the kings sprung from the dynasties of the Sun and Moon, have sent me diadems and ornaments'.[1] These statements may be taken for what they are worth, for we have at least a partial indication of the actual course of events from the few South Indian inscriptions.

Parākramabāhu entered Polonnaruva in his 26th year (1262), several years after the defeat of Māgha.[2] This he did after the defeat of another enemy, namely Candrabhānu, who invaded his kingdom a second time.[3] It is an interesting coincidence that it is approximately about this time, viz. the tenth year of Vīra Pāndya (c. 1263), that the latter claims to have taken 'the crown and the crowned head of the Sāvakan'.[4] This is perhaps more than a coincidence, and points in favour of Paranavitana's view that Parākramabāhu and the Pāndyas were acting together on some kind of understanding. He adds in conclusion:

> 'This Jāvaka /i.e. the Jāvaka referred to in the Pāndya inscription/ can be no other than Candrabhānu. As the same cannot be slain more than once, we may conclude that the Jāvaka king lost his life in a battle in which the Sinhalese and the Pāndyas fought as allies. Eulogists on either side would have given the full credit for the Jāvaka's defeat to their own hero, allowing no diminution of his glory by stating that the achievement was facilitated by an ally.'[5]

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIII, 23; LXXXVII, 29.

[2] The variant reading satvisivana havurudu (twenty seventh year) is also given, but savisi (twenty sixth) may be preferred, Pjv., 137, note 16.

[3] Cv., LXXXVIII, 62 ff; Pjv., 135 ff.

[4] A.R:E., No. 588 of 1916.

[5] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 627. He seems to have modified this view later, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VII, 193.

While we are inclined to accept this conclusion, as it offers the most plausible interpretation of these events as reflected in the confused and conflicting accounts, it is none the less necessary to give further consideration to the arguments adduced in support of this view.

In the first place, the argument that a Pāṇḍya-Sinhalese alliance would be consistent with the alignment of the powers contending for the mastery of South India during this period is not a very strong one. It has been suggested that Māgha must have ranged on the side of the Coḷas while the Sinhalese allied with the Pāṇḍyas.[1] Reference has been made to a Parākramabāhu 'king of Ceylon' (Iḷattu rāja), who lost his life while fighting on the side of Kopperunjiñga - the Kāḍava chieftain who rebelled and took the Coḷa 'emperor' Rājarāja III captive.[2] This record is dated in the 16th year of a Coḷa king Rājarāja (1231/2 A.D.). It has been suggested that this Parākramabāhu could be identified with Teṉṉilanilaṅkaikon Parākramabāhu Nic-Caṅka Mallar of the Tamil inscription from Paṇḍuvasnuvara. It is consequently argued that the Sinhalese kings ranged themselves on the side of the opponents of the Coḷas as they did in the past.[3]

In our discussion of that inscription, we have shown that it should be referred to the Kāliṅga king Nissanka Malla, and it would

---

[1] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 621-22.

[2] Hultzch, Ep. Ind., VII, 167, lines 5-6, tr. 168.

[3] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 622.

therefore be difficult to identify these two rulers.[1] Besides, we have seen that the ruler mentioned in the Paṅḍuvasnuvara Inscription flourished in the last decade of the 12th century and the date of the present record is 1231/2, so that the time gap between the two rulers is also considerable (though this may not be a decisive objection). We are inclined to believe that the ally of the Kāḍava chief was some local ruler who styled himself 'king of Ceylon'. Anyhow the point that has been made is that like this Parākramabāhu, who had joined an enemy of the Coḷas, the Daṁbadeṇiya kings of a later date would have followed the same policy and ranged themselves on the side of the Pāṇḍyas - the traditional enemies of the Coḷas.

Such an alignment, however, would not have been particularly useful during this period, for by the middle of the 13th century the Coḷas had almost been reduced to insignificance, and they could no longer prove a threat to Pāṇḍya supremacy. It is true that in about the tenth century A.D. the Sinhalese and Pāṇḍya kings were in an alliance in their efforts to withstand the expansion of Coḷa power under Parāntaka I and his successors. At that time the Sinhalese kings tried in fact to bolster up the dwindling fortunes of the Pāṇḍyas against the rising tide of Coḷa imperialism, to which both parties were in the end forced to succumb. But by the time of Parākramabāhu II the situation in South India had changed completely, and the reverse process was at work when the Pāṇḍyas had established their supremacy

---

[1] See above, 197-204.

and brought the Colas to virtual subjection.[1] In this context, an alliance with the Sinhalese kings would have been of very little use to the Pāṇḍyas. But it must however be remembered that in spite of these changes in the power politics of Southern India, the Sinhalese would have continued to look upon the Colas as their traditional enemies. The Sinhalese kings, therefore, might have been led to throw in their lot with the Pāṇḍyas.

Similarly the presence of certain members of a Ceylon trading corporation, the Valañjiyar of South (?) Ceylon, in the Pāṇḍya country during the time of Vīra Pāṇḍya, amongst the pious donees to sacred shrines there, is no argument for the existence of a political alliance between the two countries.[2] Political conflicts were hardly an obstacle to commercial and cultural relations between these countries. And we know of the presence of the members of this trading corporation in South India at an earlier date, as referred to in the epigraphic records of Kulōttuṅga III (1178-1216) and Māṟavarman Sundara Pāṇḍya (c. 1216) so that their presence in the Pāṇḍya country in the time of Vīra Pāṇḍya is not of great consequence so far as the question of a political alliance between Parākramabāhu and the Pāṇḍyas is concerned.[3]

There are, however, other considerations which, taken together,

---

[1] The Colas, 417-38; Anurādhapura Yugaya, 275-78; The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, 157 ff.

[2] A.R.E., 598 of 1926: 1926-27, pp. 92-93.

[3] A.R.E., 505 of 1922-23. See also A.R.E., 406-407 of 1914; 1915, p.102, para. 32.

would point to some kind of political understanding between the Sinhalese king and the Pāṇḍyas. We have already mentioned the marriage links which connected the two royal families from early times.[1] There is also some indication that Parākramabāhu II himself belonged to Pāṇḍya stock.[2] Further, as Paranavitana has pointed out, the author of the Cūlavaṃsa makes complimentary references to the Pāṇḍya kings even when they appeared as invaders.[3] The Pāṇḍivaṃsa was held in high esteem in this period, as for example, the author of the Pūjāvaliya refers with pride to the Sumaṅgala Thera of Mahanet-pā-mula (Mahānetra-prasāda-mūla), who was of the same pupillary succession as himself and who belonged to that family.[4] In the light of these circumstances and, particularly, in view of the memories of friendly relations between the two royal families in the past it is not unlikely that the Pāṇḍya kings showed some favour to the Sinhalese king, even if it was of little benefit to them politically.

There are some indications in the Muḍumiyāmalai Praśasti which lend some support to this view. Some difficulties in the text render their precise implication uncertain. But it is reasonably clear that

---

[1] See above, 124.

[2] See above, 93 ff., 124.

[3] Cv., LXXX, 51-53; XC, 43-47.

[4] 'Ekala ubhayakula pariśuddhava pävati Gaṇaväsi kulehi aviniṣṭavū mahā Paṇḍivaṃsa äti Vātagiri parvatayehi ema rajahugē ārādhanāven sivupasadāna ladin vāsaya kalā vū Mahanet-pā-mula Sumaṃgala mahā sthavirayangē sahōdara vū ovungenma kisiyam daham nayak dänagattā vū Mayurapāda parivenādhipati Buddhaputra sthavirayan', Pjv., 140-41.

reference is made to a minister (se.....tirunda mandiri), who appears to have sought the aid of the Pāṇḍya king (saraṇamai tigaḷndindu etc.).[1] Paranavitana believes that the minister in question would have been an officer of Parākramabāhu II, who sought the intervention of the Pāṇḍya king in order to secure his help in dealing with the enemies in Rājaraṭṭha.[2] Although there is no conclusive proof it may be pointed out that in the reign of Parākramabāhu there is an officer by the name of Devapatirāja, who occupied a very influential position.[3] He was one of the most trusted men Parākramabāhu had, whose services, particularly connected with the promotion of Buddhism, are recounted in detail in the Cūlavaṃsa. The grammatical work Sidatsaṅgarāva composed in the reign of Parākramabāhu II states that it was written at the request of the minister Patirājadeva (Patirajadev āmāti, i.e. Patirājadēva amātya), who is described as having fought the Keraḷas with great audacity. We are told that the waters of the Mahaväli were reddened by the blood of the Keraḷas when Patirāja took to battle.[4] Though this is clearly a

---

[1] T.B.G., LXXVII, 266, strophes 7-8, lines 6-8.

[2] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 627.

[3] Cv., LXXXVI, 3 ff; Pjv., 125 ff.

[4] 'Saňda vana siňdu kïya kuṁbuyona nama satarā kivī seveta toda Välinī yaḷa togorā aruṇu kiheni vī Keraḷan läbā hurirā pāṭivanedesā yuda Patiraja diya isurā', Sidat Sangara Vistara Sannaya, Ed. Ratmalānē Dharmārāma (1931), p. 216, v. 11, p. 231, v. 24;
It is stated that the Pjv. was written at the request of the minister named Devapatirāja; this text refers to him also as Prime Minister (Devapatirāja nam agamātiyānan), Pjv., ed. Bentara Śraddhātiṣya, (1930), Ch. I, 12; see also the Alutnuvara Dēvālaya Karavīma, Dunukēṭuvaṃsabhijāta Delgas (gamuvē) Dēvapatirāja nam agra amātyayānan, Sinh. Sa. lipi, 67-68.

poetic description of Devapatirāja or Patirājadeva it appears that he was an important minister, whose activities were not confined to his services to Buddhism, as he played an active role in the wars of Parākramabāhu against the Keralas. It is therefore not altogether impossible to identify this Devapatirāja with the minister who sought the aid of the Pāṇḍya king.

Another important, but somewhat vague, phrase in the Kuḍumiyāmalai Praśasti suggests that the expedition was undertaken in order to uphold in proper form the ancient practice of royalty (araiśiyal vaḷakkam neṟippaḍa nāṭṭum kuṟipinuḷ).[1] If any significance can be attached to this statement, there is some reason to believe that Vīra Pāṇḍya invaded Ceylon, at least on the pretext of assisting Parākramabāhu in his campaigns against his enemies. Parākramabāhu II was certainly the lawful and acknowledged ruler of the island at this time and had a right to his kingdom according to 'the ancient practice of royalty'. It may be argued that the minister in question could have been in the service of a ruler in the north of Ceylon on whose behalf Vīra Pāṇḍya intervened. But according to a statement elsewhere in the text of this inscription 'the son of the Śāvaka' is blamed for his previous recalcitrance.[2] This ruler of a part of Northern Ceylon could therefore not have been the king for whom Pāṇḍya aid was sought. On the other hand, if Vīra Pāṇḍya interfered on behalf of an invader who had occupied a part of the kingdom which legally belonged to Parākrama-

---

[1] T.B.G., LXXVII, 266, strophe 7, lines 4-5. See also K. N. Sastri, 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511.

[2] T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophe 11.

bāhu, he could hardly have claimed with any degree of justification that his purpose was 'to uphold in proper form the ancient practice of royalty'. If Vīra Pāṇḍya did so at least with the pretext of assisting Parākramabāhu, the claim made by the former would become meaningful, for the latter was the lawful ruler of the island, though his effective authority did not extend much beyond Māyāraṭṭha. On these considerations, there is reason to believe that Vīra Pāṇḍya invaded Ceylon claiming to render assistance to Parākramabāhu. But it remains for us to see whether the Sinhalese ruler achieved his ultimate objective in seeking Pāṇḍyan aid.

Now it would be relevant to take into account the information on the 'Jāvaka' or 'Śāvakan' from the Ceylon sources. We have already considered the first Jāvaka invasion which took place in 1247. There it was shown that Candrabhānu who came at the head of the Jāvakas was defeated but that he was likely to have held his own in a limited part of Northern Ceylon.[1] Our main sources refer to a second invasion by this Jāvaka ruler. On this occasion he invaded with apparently greater preparation and strength than on his first invasion:

> 'After that time the Lord of men Candrabhānu, formerly beaten after hard fighting, having collected from the countries of the Paṇḍus and the Coḷas and elsewhere many Damiḷa soldiers, representing a greater force, landed with his Jāvaka army in Mahātittha. After the king had brought over to his side the Sīhalas dwelling in Padī, Kurundī and other districts he marched to

---

[1] See above. 361 ff.

> Subhagiri. He set up there an armed camp and sent forth messengers with the message, "I shall take Tisīhala. I shall not leave it to thee. Yield up to me therefore together with the Tooth Relic of the Sage, the Bowl Relic and the royal dominion. If thou wilt not then fight".'[1]

Our main sources indicate that prince Vijayabāhu and Vīrabāhu rose to the occasion, inflicted a crushing defeat upon the 'Lord of men Candrabhānu flying defencelsss'. The women of his harem, the elephants and horses, swords and weapons, the treasures, trumpets of victory, the umbrella of victory, the drum of victory, the banner of victory and all the other royal paraphenalia were seized and sent to Parākramabāhu who resided in Jambuddoṇi.[2] According to some contemporary sources Candrabhānu lost his life in this battle.[3]

Before we can compare the data in the Kuḍumiyāmalai Praśasti with the version given in the Ceylon Chronicles cited above, it is necessary to fix the possible date of the second Jāvaka invasion. This event is not dated in any of our sources, but from the narrative in the Pūjāvaliyya and the Cūlavaṃsa it is clear that this event took place after prince Vijayabāhu had been entrusted with the administration of the kingdom.[4] From a document entitled the Alutnuvara Devālaya Karavīma we learn that Parākramabāhu was afflicted with an incurable ailment in his twenty-second year (1258).[5] Though this tradition is not mentioned in the

---

[1] Cv., LXXXVIII, 62-66; Pjv., 135; Hvv., 32.

[2] Cv., LXXXVIII, 67-75; Pjv., 136.

[3] Pjv., 136; Hvv., 32.

[4] Cv., LXXXVII, 73; LXXXVIII, 62 ff.

[5] 'Devisivana avuruddehi kisiyam kāyikābādhayak mūlikavā madak basa vikklavā (cont.)

principal sources it seems to rest on some foundation. It also explains the necessity for having to entrust his son with the administration of the kingdom. Thus Vijayabāhu must have taken over this responsibility in the year his father came to be afflicted with this disease, i.e. 1258, or a few years later. Besides, the filial affection shown by his sons towards Parākramabāhu in the last stages, and the latter's virtual inactivity while his sons and prince Vīrabāhu took over the defence preparations in the face of the threats of foreign invasions confirms further the tradition of the incurable ailment which overtook this monarch.[1] On this basis it is reasonable to hold that the second invasion of Candrabhānu took place after the twenty second year of Parākramabāhu (1258). It is possible to define the approximate date of this invasion more precisely. We learn from the Pūjāvaliya that prince Vijayabāhu after defeating Candrabhānu entered Polonnaruva in the 26th year of the reign of Parākramabāhu.[2] This brings us to 1262. We can now confidently hold that the second invasion of the Jāvakas took place between 1258 and 1262. The restoration of the religious shrines in Polonnaruva and Anurādhapura and the desire of Parākramabāhu to be consecrated in the former capital were urgent. It is therefore very likely that Vijayabāhu took the first

---

(cont.) kathā akkalvā giya heyin vaidya-prayōgādī śānti vidhi karavā śamana guṇayak nopänuṇu heyin, Sinh. Sā. Lipi., 67.

---

[1] 'Thought the Ruler: my royal father shall have no grief arising from the separation from his sons and made his two younger brothers Parākramabāhu and Jayabāhu dwell continually near their father', Cv., LXXXVIII, 18-19; see also 29-30.

[2] Pjv., 137.

opportunity of performing this task to bring satisfaction to his ailing father. It is, therefore, reasonable to hold that Vijayabāhu entered Polonnaruva soon after the defeat of Candrabhānu and busied himself with the tasks referred to above. As Vijayabāhu entered Polonnaruva in 1262/3 the defeat of Candrabhānu is most likely to have taken place in the same or the preceding year (1261). This date would very closely approximate the year of Candrabhānu's defeat.

In the light of the chronology of the events discussed above it is significant to note the claim made by Vira Pāndya in an inscription of his tenth year (1263) that he 'took the crown and the crowned head of the Sāvakan'.[1] In the next year (1264) the Kudumiyāmalai Prasasti refers to the surrender of the son of the Śāvakan and the reinstatement of the latter to the kingdom ruled by his father.[2] Thus the synchronism as well as other details would establish beyond doubt that the South Indian records and the Ceylon Chronicles refer to the same events. Our difficulties, however, are not over. A comparative study of the two accounts would still leave some conflicting elements to which we should now call attention.

The accounts of Candrabhānu in the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya contain a few significant details. Paranavitana is right in suggesting

[1] A.R.E., 588 of 1916.

[2] 'pandēval seyyādigal seydirunda Sāva(ka)n maindan talami (?) rundiriñja', strophe 11, lines 1-2; 'tandai yānda tadangadal-Ilam maindan per...gum', strophe 12, lines 1-2; the latter portion is omitted in the Pudukottah text, see Inscriptions of the Pudukottah State, No. 366, pp. 238-39; T.B.G., LXXVII, 267.

that Candrabhānu was in a much stronger position in the second invasion.[1] In the Cūlavaṃsa it is stated that 'he had brought over to his side the Sīhalas dwelling in Padī Kurundi and other districts' before he marched to Subhagiri. The Pūjāvaliya adds to this list of areas brought under his influence Mānāmatu, Goṇa and Debarapaṭan, which are located in the north western and north eastern coastal regions of Ceylon.[2] An interesting observation that can be made here is that the areas where Candrabhānu is stated to have won the Sīhalas to his side correspond to a remarkable degree with the regions in which the Māgha's strongholds were located.[3] It therefore appears that Candrabhānu had extended his influence into the regions formerly occupied by Māgha.

We are told that he had 'deluded the whole world by a show of service to the world and the Sāsana'.[4] As stated earlier, it is beyond doubt that Candrabhānu was a Buddhist. This factor must have helped him to bring the people of those regions to his side. Other benevolent measures calculated to enlist the support of the people would have made him acceptable to the Buddhists, irrespective of the fact that he was an invader. Candrabhānu as a Buddhist could have

---

[1] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 626.

[2] Cv., LXXXVIII, 64; Pjv., 135. The variant reading Mānāmatu should be preferred to Mānavatu, Pjv., 135, note 12.

[3] cf. Cv., LXXXIII, 15-18; Pjv., 116.

[4] Hvv., 32; Elu Av., 71, 'Lokasāsana samgraha kirīm vasayen vaṃcā karana lada siyalu lōkayā āti'.

successfully appealed to the sentiments of the people, precisely because these were the regions that undoubtedly suffered heavily under Māgha's rule of persecution and oppression. To the Sinhalese of these regions Candrabhānu is likely to have appeared as a devout Buddhist rather than as a hostile invader. It seems certain that Parākramabāhu's writ did not include the regions in which Candrabhānu enlisted popular support. Such a development could not, however, have taken place immediately after the invasion. It must have taken time before Candrabhānu could have succeeded in winning over the people. The fact that he ruled over these regions for a considerable period is confirmed by the Kuḍumiyāmalai Praśasti in which the Pāṇḍya king claims to have reinstated the son of the Śavakan (Śāvakan maindan) to the kingdom ruled by his father (tandai Yāṇḍa taḍaṅgaḍal Ṭḷam).[1] This would give further confirmation to the possibility indicated earlier that, though Candrabhānu was defeated on his first invasion, he continued to rule over part of Northern Ceylon and probably did not return to his kingdom of Tāmbraliṅga. There he gradually won over the sympathy and support of the Sinhalese until he became powerful enough to challenge Parākramabāhu from a position of strength. In fact, none of our sources specifically state that he was forced to flee from the island. The Cūlavaṃsa refers to 'putting to flight the Jāvakas in combat'.[2] The Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa which gives the correct name

---

[1] T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophes 11-12.

[2] Cv., LXXXIII, 48. However, not much credit can be given to the statement that 'he freed the whole region of Lankā from the foe', Cv., LXXXVIII, 62; 'Ekala peravaka piya rajahugē yuddhayehi pärada pälā Candrabhānu raja', Pjv., 135; see also p. 117 which contains a statement with the implication that he was killed in the first expedition.

of the country from which he hailed does not distinguish between the two invasions but, as his death in battle is referred to, the second rather than the first appears to have been taken into account.[1] There is thus good reason to believe that Candrabhānu succeeded in establishing his rule over a part of Northern Ceylon, probably after his first invasion of Ceylon.

If thus Candrabhānu succeeded in securing the support of a substantial section of the people of those areas in Rājarattha it is quite understandable if he entertained ambitions of extending his sphere of influence southwards, thereby coming into conflict with Parākramabāhu. He thus made this attempt when he was powerful enough to do so. His army was supplemented with recruits from the countries of the Pāndyas and the Colas and was certainly more powerful than the army with which he led the first expedition.[2] It is difficult to infer from the statement in the Cūlavamsa that the recruits were collected from the countries of the Pāndyas and the Colas, with the Pāndya king's connivance, as suggested by Paranavitana. Rather, they may be regarded as ordinary mercenaries from the Tamil country, as Nilakanta Sastri has done.[3]

There are very clear indications both in the Cūlavamsa and the Pūjāvaliya that Parākramabāhu had sensed a serious threat to his authority

---

[1] Hvv., 32.

[2] Cv., LXXXVIII, 62-63 ff.

[3] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 626; 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 519.

by an imminent invasion of his kingdom. Vijayabāhu, who was in charge of the administration of the kingdom at this time, devoted his attention to military preparations. His younger brother Tilokamalla was given the necessary garrisons and was stationed at Mahāvattalagāma (Vattala on the sea coast near Colombo). He was entrusted with the defence of the region from Jambuddoṇi up to the southern sea against an enemy who would land in the south-western and southern parts of the island.[1] Protection of the kingdom on the northern front was looked upon as a particularly difficult task on account of 'foes coming from the opposite coast' and 'since it is here that fighting is wont to begin'. This task was entrusted to his brother Bhuvanekabāhu, who was considered suited to take over this responsibility. He was stationed at Sundarapabbata (Yāpahu) with the requisite troops.[2] Vijayabāhu and Vīrabāhu, who had shown great fighting ability and courage in the first encounter with Candrabhānu, took over the general supervision of the overall defence strategy, at the same time crushing any elements of opposition to their rule.[3] As Paranavitana has shown, these preparations were evidently made to meet the threat of an invasion by Candrabhānu.[4]

---

[1] Cv., LXXXVIII, 20-22; Pjv., 133.

[2] Cv., LXXXVIII, 23-26; Pjv., 133.

[3] Cv., LXXXVIII, 27-28.

[4] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 625-26.

The Cūlavaṃsa gives an account of some of the religious activities in which Vijayabāhu engaged when he set out for the restoration of Pulatthinagara.[1] These activities included the repair of old vihāras and shrines and the foundation of new ones. Most of the places he visited at this time were located in the Hill country (Malaya). This account precedes that of the second invasion of Candrabhānu but it is clear that Vijayabāhu's activities were not entirely confined to those connected with religion. He devoted his time to strengthening the military defences where necessary. Perhaps he realised the importance of a place like the rock-fortress of Vātagiri (Vākirigala in the Kägalla District), which formed an important link in the military strategy followed by Vijayabāhu I in his campaigns against the Colas. We are told:

> 'Then he betook himself with the four-membered army in the desired strength to the great and loftily situated fortress of Vātagiri. After building a splendid royal palace on the summit of this mountain, surrounded by an extraordinarily high wall, he stored there in case of need, the whole of the great treasure given over to him by his royal father.'[2]

Similarly at Hatthigiripura (Kuruṇägala, in the Kuruṇägala District) which some time later became a royal capital for a brief period, the defences were strengthened by encircling the city with a wall and a moat.[3] He also visited Gaṅgāsiripura (Gampola) on the banks of the

---

[1] Cv., LXXXVIII, 29-61; Pjv., 134-35.

[2] Cv., LXXXVIII, 43-45; U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 425, 433.

[3] Cv., LXXXVIII, 60; J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS, VI, 105-106.

Mahaväli, which also later became a royal capital, and restored the Nigamaggāmapāsāda Vihāra (Niyamgampāya).[1] Prior to this, Parākramabāhu II had devoted attention to this region when his minister Devapatirāja founded Vihāras and improved the lines of communications by the construction of bridges across the streams, on behalf of the pilgrims to Samantakūṭa.[2] Vijayabāhu therefore appears to have taken into account also the military importance of some of the places he visited and possibly desired to win the support and sympathy of the people in this region in his efforts to deal with the invaders.

It is now possible to consider the data in the Kuḍumiyāmalai Praśasti and determine how far they can be reconciled with the accounts given in the Chronicles. We have already referred to the appeal by a minister to Vīra Pāṇḍya. According to the interpretation by Nilakanta Sastri of this record, the implication of the statement is that there was a dispute between two kings of Ceylon in which one of the parties appealed to the Pāṇḍya king for intervention.[3] There is, however, no definite reference to a dispute in the record. This possibility is evidently based on the reference to the defeat and death in the battle-field of one of the kings of Ceylon. Then the record goes on to detail his defeat and the capture of his troops and royal paraphenalia.[4] The

---

[1] Cv., LXXXVIII, 48-50; Codrington, S.H.C., 82-87; J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXII, 260-309.

[2] Cv., LXXXVI, 1 ff.; Pjv., 126.

[3] 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511.

[4] T.B.G., LXXVII, 266-67, strophes 8-10.

phrase Iḷamannar ilaguvaril oruvanai vīḻapporodu vinmiśai-yeṛṛi would literally convey the sense: 'Of the kings of Ceylon, having defeated one and raised him to the other world' (viz. killed him). If the word ilaguvaril is derived from the Tamil word ilaṅguvaril as it appears to be, its meaning, according to the Tamil Lexicon is 'luminary' and would not convey the sense of 'two' according to that authority.[1] If this is the case there would be no direct textual reference to two kings or to a dispute between them. But the reference to an appeal to Vīra Pāṇḍya by a minister from Ceylon and 'the defeat and death of one of the (luminary ?) kings of Ceylon' which immediately follows, would make it possible to render the interpretation given by Nilakanta Sastri that there was a dispute between two kings of Ceylon, and that Vīra Pāṇḍya intervened on an appeal made by one of the parties to it, for the Pāṇḍya king's aid.[2]

Then the record goes on to detail the possessions of the defeated king which were captured. These included the regiments of forces (paḍaippuraviyam), chariots (kaṇammaṇittēr), silk garments (śinavaḍam), ear-ornaments (nāgattōḍu), a heap of the nine gems (navamaṇikkuvai), the throne of the enemy (ariāśanam), crown (muḍi), armoury (kaḍagam), long pearl necklace (muḻumaṇiyāra), the flag (koḍi), the umbrella

---

[1] Tamil Lexicon, I, 340.

[2] 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511.

(kudai), the drum ? (murasu), conch (jangam), staff (tandu), the seven elements of royalty (arairu keludāym) and so forth. After this it is stated that the (Pāndya) flag with the double carp was hoisted on Koṇamalai and Tirikūṭagiri, and that the elephant corps of (another) king was captured (enai vēndanai ānai tirai kondu).[1]

We then come to a very important part of the record which mentions the Sāva(ka)n maidan (the son of the Sāva(ka)n) 'who was formerly recalcitrant' (pandēval seyyātikal seydirunda).[2] At this point the text is difficult, but Nilakanta Sastri makes out that after his (of the son of the Jāvaka) submission to Vīra Pāndya the Sāvakan maindan was presented with the anklet of heroes (vīrakkaḷal) and was restored to 'the kingdom of Iḷam formerly ruled by his father (ūrvalañje(y) vittu tandai yāṇda taḍangaḍal Iḷam maindan pe....gum).[3] The phrase yāṇda to pe....gum is omitted in the published text of this record in the Inscriptions of the Pudukoṭṭah State.[4] The statement which follows, that the son of the Jāvaka was taken round in procession and was permitted to go to Anurāpuri (Anurādhapura ?) is based on an emendation of the text by Nilakanta Sastri and is therefore less certain.[5]

---

[1] T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophe 8, lines 5-6; strophes 9-10.

[2] T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophe 11, lines 1-2,

[3] T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, Strophes 11-12; 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511-12.

[4] Op.cit., No. 366, pp. 238-239.

[5] 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511-12.

We have already indicated the probability that the minister who sought Pāṇḍyan aid was an officer of Parākramabāhu II. If that is accepted it follows that the latter was a party to the implied dispute between the (two) kings of Ceylon in which Vīra Pāṇḍya appears to have intervened. Now who were the kings with whom Parākramabāhu was in conflict? We know that he waged a long struggle with Māgha, but it has been shown that the latter had been defeated several years before the probable date of these events. Besides we have seen that Candrabhānu had extended his influence into areas which had once been Māgha's strongholds, suggesting that the latter had quitted the scene by this time. According to the Pūjāvaliya account Māgha's defeat appears to have taken place about the year 1255. In fact, if the Cūlvaṃsa is relied on, his defeat may be placed sometime before 1247. We have preferred the view of Paranavitana based on the Pūjāvaliya version that Māgha's defeat could be dated about 1255.[1] Vīra Pāṇḍya's expeditinn to Ceylon, as shown above, appears to have taken place some years after this event. Therefore there is some reason to believe that Māgha was not the victim who suffered death at the hands of Vīra Pāṇḍya. Further, we learn from the Prasasti that the son of the Sāvaka was reinstated in the kingdom ruled by his father, which bears the implication that the latter had been killed in battle. K.N. Sastri has shown the difficulties in accepting the view that Māgha was a Jāvaka.[2] Apart from this, considerations

---

[1] See above, 323-25.

[2] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VIII (1962), 125-40.

of age also make it improbable that Māgha was yet alive for he would have been far advanced in age and would hardly have survived these hard times. This, however, is a difficulty which applies in some measure even in the case of Candrabhānu, for the time gap which separates the Jaiyā Inscription of 1230 from these events is quite considerable. But this is not necessarily a serious difficulty and, if we are to accept a statement from the Kuḍumiyāmalai Prasasti, Candrabhānu's son was already associated in the administration, or was at least of sufficient age and ability to shoulder that responsibility.[1] Who then was this king who was in conflict with Parākramabāhu, and who eventually suffered death at the hands of Vīra Pāṇḍya when the latter intervened in the affairs of Ceylon to set things right?

There is very strong reason to endorse the view of Paranavitana that the king who suffered death in battle, in the momentous events which led to the intervention of Vīra Pāṇḍya in the affairs of Ceylon, was no other but Candrabhānu himself.[2] Paranavitana soon changed this view and came to regard the Jāvaka and the son of the Jāvaka in Vīra Pāṇḍya's inscriptions as referring to Māgha and a son of the latter, based on his identification of Kalinga in the Malay Peninsula and taking Māgha to have been a Jāvaka.[3] We have referred to some the difficulties

---

[1] T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophe 12, 'tandai yāṇḍa taḍaṅgaḍal Īlam maindan per...gum etc.

[2] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, (1960), 627.

[3] J.R.A.S.Cey. Br., NS. VII, (1961), 193-194.

in accepting this view.[1] Candrabhānu quite clearly was the formidable enemy to meet the threat of whom Parākramabāhu was forced to set up the elaborate defences.

We have already noted the synchronism between Vīra Pāṇḍya's intervention and Candrabhānu's second invasion, as given in the Ceylon Chronicles. Vīra Pāṇḍya claims in an inscription of his tenth year (1263) referred to earlier that he 'took the crown and the crowned head of the Sāvakan'.[2] In the prasasti of his eleventh year (1264) now under consideration, he elaborates the defeat and death in the battle field of one king of Ceylon, whose entire royal paraphernalia was seized. We are inclined to believe that both these records refer to the defeat and death of one and the same king - the Jāvaka, namely Candrabhānu. In the former it is referred to in brief, while the account was elaborated in the prasasti issued in the very next year. Nilakanta Sastri, however, expressed the view that the statement that Vīra Pāṇḍya 'took the crown and the crowned head of the Sāvakan' implies that the vanquished ruler paid obeisance to Vīra Pāṇḍya in open assembly, and not that he was killed.[3] In the present case, however, the statement could well be taken in its literal sense. This interpretation is also in keeping with the re-instatement of the Jāvaka's son to the kingdom 'formerly ruled by his

---

[1] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VIII, 125-40.

[2] A.R.E., 588 of 1916.

[3] T.B.G., LXXVII, 255.

father', who evidently met his death in his encounter with the forces of Vīra Pāṇḍya and Parākramabāhu. Let us now see the ultimate fate which befell Candrabhānu according to the Ceylon sources to determine how far it agrees with the version given in the inscriptions of Vīra Pāṇḍya.

Candrabhānu and his Jāvaka army strengthened by mercenary levies from the countries of the Pāṇḍyas and the Coḷas marched up to Subhagiri and demanded from Parākramabāhu the Tooth Relic and the Bowl Relic and threatened to take Tīsīhala. Vijayabāhu and Vīrabāhu went out to battle and we are told that Candrabhānu and his forces were decisively defeated and all his royal paraphernalia, the women of his harem, horses and elephants, royal treasure, trumpets of victory, the umbrella of victory, the drum of victory, the banner of victory were seized and sent to Parākramabāhu. 'Having in this way fought the fiery battle, conquered the province and won the victory he united Laṅkā under the umbrella of his dominion'.[1]

Now the synchronism of the invasion of Vīra Pāṇḍya and that of Candrabhānu is particularly significant. The account of the defeat and death of the king of Ceylon referred to in the inscription of Vīra Pāṇḍya would at once call to one's mind the Cūlavaṃsa account of the defeat of Candrabhānu cited above. The Pali Chronicle does not specifically state that Candrabhānu was killed, but the Hatthavanagallavihāra

[1] Cv., LXXXVIII, 62-76; compare this account of the defeat of Candrabhānu with that of the ruler who was killed by Vīra Pāṇḍya, and whose royal paraphernalia was seized, T.B.G., LXXVII, 266-67, strophes 8-9.

vaṃsa would have us believe that he met with his death in this war.[1] The province (maṇḍalaṃ) referred to in the Cūlavaṃsa passage is probably Rājaraṭṭha. This may lend some support to the view that Candrabhānu had already been in control of a part of Rājaraṭṭha before invading Parā. Kramabāhu's territory - a point which is also confirmed by the Kuḍumiyā-malai Prasasti.[2] The ignominous defeat suffered by Candrabhānu is understandable if he was thus attacked simultaneously by the forces of Parākramabāhu and those of Vīra Pāṇḍya and, as shown by Paranavitana, both parties evidently claimed the credit of this victory for themselves, making no acknowledgment of the assistance one received from the other.[3]

If Vīra Pāṇḍya came to the assistance of Parākramabāhu it may appear strange that once the major enemy had been defeated he should have chosen to reinstate Candrabhānu's son to rule over the kingdom. It may have been a concession to expediency, though itwas a measure which detracted from honest diplomacy on the part of Vīra Pāṇḍya. Paranavitana explains that, 'Instead of a strong Sinhalese state in a unified Ceylon, the Pāṇḍyas no doubt wanted both the contending parties in the Island to be subordinate allies of theirs'.[4] Such action was also commonplace in India. Even so one may doubt whether Ceylon could

---

[1] Hvv., 32.

[2] 'taṇḍai yāṇḍa taḍaṅgaḍal Ilam', T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophe 12, line 2.

[3] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, (1960), 627. He appears to have modified this view later, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS, VII, (1961), 193.

[4] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 628.

have become a serious threat to the Pāṇḍyas at this time even if the island was united under Parākramabāhu.

The Kuḍumiyāmalai Prasasti refers to the elephant corps of the 'other king ' (ēnai vēndan) from whom Vīra Pāṇḍya claims to have taken it as tribute.[1] The possession of an elephant corps may indicate that he was of a higher rank than that of a feudatory or forest chieftain (vanniyāja). Thus if 'one of the kings of Īlam ' (Īlamannar ilaguvaril oruvanai) put to death by Vīra Pāṇḍya had been Candrabhanu, 'the other king (ēnai vēndan) may well be identified with Parākramabāhu, as suggested by Paranavitana,[2] Candrabhānu and Parākramabāhu being the two parties to the dispute which led to the intervention of the Pāṇḍya king. Although this would be a plausible explanation, the identification of the ēnai vēndanai has to be left open. It is not impossible that this form of tribute and acknowledgment of Pāṇḍyan supremacy was the price which Parākramabāhu had to pay for the assistance he received in dealing with his enemies.

In the foregoing discussion we have attempted to analyse and interpret these events as far as possible, within the limits set by the conflicting and confused accounts, of important events in the troubled history of this period. From the above survey it is indeed quite clear that the Ceylonese sources are silent on these momentous events. Once again we are reminded of Geiger's apt observation that

---

[1] T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophe 10, line 6.

[2] J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS., VII, 194, note. 82.

'Not what is said but what is left unsaid is the besetting difficulty of Sinhalese history'.[1] In this connection we have also to bear in mind that but for the aid of these few South Indian inscriptions an inaccurate picture of the times would have emerged in our minds. For example it is said:

> 'Even the monarchs of foreign lands have now come under his influence'

and further,

> 'Having spread my fame everywhere also in foreign lands, I have for long held sway in just fashion. I have brought hither king's daughters from Jambudīpa with gifts and thereby made the nobles in foreign land your kinsmen. The heroes of the Pāṇḍus and Coḷas, the kings sprung from the dynasties of the Sun and Moon have sent me diadems and ornaments. Also I have gathered together without ceasing a mass of jewels which can be enjoyed not only by you all here, but even in future time by seven generations of my descendants, even as the (god) Kubera (gathered together) his nine treasures, the shell and the rest'.[2]

Here we have in the Ceylon Chronicles the counterpart of the vain and unfounded claims made by court poets on behalf of Vīra Pāṇḍya, which Nilakanta Sastri rightly described as 'court poetry, not history'.[3] At best these accounts can reflect little more than the customary exchanges of envoys and courtesies, which must have formed part of the relations between these dynasties, particularly appropriate in view of the relations between Ceylon and South India in this period.

---

[1] Cv. Tr., I, Introduction, p.v.

[2] Cv., LXXXIII, 23; LXXXVII, 27-31; Pjv., 116-17, 129.

[3] 8th All Ind. Or. Conf., 511.

Chapter VI

The Importance of the Reign of Parākramabāhu II

Once the defeat of Candrabhānu was achieved a great task before Parākramabāhu was the restoration of the ancient capitals, especially Polonnaruva. The Cūlavamsa devotes an entire chapter to a description of the manner in which Vijayabāhu attempted to accomplish this task.[1] In fact the account of the restoration of the sacred cities gives the impression that it was looked upon as a kind of holy mission. Vijayabāhu, who is depicted as a particularly pious personage, appears to have been the chief architect of this movement. On the occasion of his being selected to take over the responsibility of administration, the Samgha espoused his cause with great enthusiasm, on account of his great piety, generosity and popularity.[2] Vijayabāhu undoubtedly possessed not only such virtues as the Chronicles attribute to him but was indeed a man of considerable ability, who successfully organized the defence of the kingdom when it was faced with the invasion of Candrabhānu - a determined and powerful enemy. Having defeated the Jāvakas, no doubt with the assistance of Vīrabāhu and his brothers, as well as the Pāndyas, he now undertook the restoration of the sacred cities.

We are told that when Vijayabāhu set out on this mission even women and children displayed great enthusiasm and were keen to join him.

---

[1] Cv., LXXXVIII, 'The Rebuilding of Pulatthinagara'.

[2] Cv., LXXXVII, 43 ff.; Pjv., 130-31.

> 'When a certain number of dignitaries, soldiers and others out of laziness were not minded to go their wives said to them: "Ye, our lords may come with us or not, at any rate we are going with the king who seeks the best and we shall dwell with him in the newly restored splendid town". And they set forth therewith on their way before them. Even children deserted their fathers, if they would not go with them and followed the king. When the king beheld the great crowd of people setting forth, each deserting his village his house and his comfortable possessions, he persuaded them again and again in his great anxiety and induced all those whom it was right to induce to return.'[1]

The Pūjāvaliya gives a similar account.[2] On the one hand it reflects the great enthusiasm with which the people looked upon the attempts of the king to restore the sacred shrines in these ancient cities which earned their unstinted veneration through the ages. On the other it appears to bring out how difficult it was to attract people back to Rajaraṭṭha. The obvious reason would have been that conditions conducive to living were no longer present there. For the irrigation system had obviously suffered and fallen into such neglect that agriculture could no longer be practised with the assurance of the harvests to which they were accustomed in the past. Foreign invasion and the repeated sacking of Rājaraṭṭha had divested this once prosperous seat of royal authority of its ancient splendour and attraction. Naturally the people showed a reluctance to return there to live under conditions

---

[1] Cv., LXXXVIII, 37-42.

[2] Pjv., 134.

perhaps more trying than in Māyāraṭṭha, to which many had come in search of protection and security, which the chronicler has described as 'laziness'. The progressive neglect of Rajaraṭṭha and its ultimate abandonment in the century that followed shows that its restoration and resettlement was difficult and ineffective.

When Vijayabāhu undertook this task conditions of uncertainty and insecurity seem to have prevailed, although the major opponent, Candrabhānu, had been eliminated. For, even after the defeat of Candrabhānu, it was considered necessary to strengthen the defences of Subhagiri by the erection of a 'high rampart' and a trench. A royal palace was built there and Bhuvanekabāhu was made to continue his residence in Subhagiri as before.[1]

Vijayabāhu entered Polonnaruva in the 26th year of Parākramabāhu's reign according to the Pūjāvaliya.[2] He made his way to the ancient royal city of Anurādhapura and initiated the restoration of the sacred shrines and other important edifices.[3] Here one may raise the question why the son of the Sāvakan, who had been reinstated in his kingdom, did not interfere when Parākramabāhu started restoration work in Anurādhapura. The reason probably is that he could not start another conflict with Parākramabāhu so soon after his defeat. This would have been

---

[1] Cv., LXXXVIII, 77-79.

[2] The reading satvisivana (twenty seventh) is found in two printed texts of the Pūjāvaliya, pjv., 137, note 16.

[3] Cv., LXXXVIII, 80 ff; Pjv., 136; Dal. S. makes no reference to restoration work done at Anuradhapura, 43-45.

even more difficult if Parākramabāhu had the Pāṇḍyas on his side. There is a vague phrase in the Kuḍumiyāmalai Inscription, in its reference to the son of the Śavakan as 'having made him not wander' (tirukkōḷam alaivāppaḍan kalittu).[1] What is really meant by this phrase is not clear, but if it conveys the above sense as is likely there is reason to believe that the aggressive mood of the Jāvaka received a setback after his defeat by Vīra Pāṇḍya and Parākramabāhu. The Sinhalese king appears to have taken advantage of this respite to effect repairs to the more important shrines in the ancient city. On the other hand the Jāvaka too was a Buddhist and may not have interfered with the religious activities of Parākramabāhu.

We are told that Vijayabāhu called in craftsmen from the surrounding area and undertook the restoration of the Ratnāvalī Cetiya, which his father had initiated. The supervision of the restoration work here was entrusted to the chief thera of the Senānātha Pariveṇa, which has been identified with the Senāpati Pariveṇa founded in the reign of Udaya II (887-898 A.D.).[2] An undated inscription from Anurādhapura belonging to Bhuvanekabāhu Mahapāṇan, a younger brother of Pārākramabāhu who occupied the position of yuvarāja during Parākramabāhu's reign, refers to the grant of land to a pariveṇa founded and named after him.[3] The Pūjāvaliya adds that repair work was also initiated in other

---

[1] T.B.G., LXXVII, 267, strophe 11, line 5.

[2] Geiger, Cv. Tr., 188, note 3.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., III, No. 30, 286-88.

important shrines in Anurādhapura. It is stated there that the jungle was cleared, repairs were effected and terraces of sand (välimalu) were built in the three Nikāyas (the Mahāvihāra, Jetavanārāma, and Abhayagiri Vihāra), in the Lohamahāpāsāda, Śrī Mahābōdhi (the shrine of the sacred Bodhi Tree) and at the Ratnāvalī Cetiya.[1]

However, the restoration of the numerous shrines and vihāras in the city, covering a vast complex of buildings neglected for nearly half a century, was evidently a tremendous task. This appears both from the Culavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya accounts. 'Now the ruler betook himself to Anurādhapura and there round about the Thūpārāma and all the other sacred places he had the mighty forest - that was like a stronghold created by Māra - felled and a wall erected which was as a bridge over the stream of craving.'[2] Apart from many years of neglect it was Polonnaruva that had become the royal capital from the time of the Cola occupation in the eleventh century and, naturally, more attention was given to Polonnaruva than to Anuradhapura, though the sanctity of the latter city was never forgotten.

Vijayabāhu initiated repairs at the more important shrines and vihāras in Anurādhapura and turned his attention to Polonnaruva. According to the accounts in the Chronicles it appears that work at Polonnaruva was taken in hand with greater urgency. This is clear from the

---

[1] Pjv., 136.

[2] Cv., LXXXVIII, 80-81, see Buddhadatta's corrections, U.C.R., VIII, 175.

more detailed account of the restoration work undertaken in Polonnaruva. It is moreover significant that vanni kings were entrusted with the protection of the city of Anuradhapura. It is stated that Vijayabāhu exchanged gifts and good wishes with these chieftains. They were presented with rocking-chairs (andoli), white umbrellas (dhavalachatta), fly-whisks (cāmara) and so forth.[1] It is significant to note that no member of his royal family was stationed to look after the city and the administration of that region. On the one hand, it points to the virtually irretrievable decline to which this ancient centre of civilisation and royal authority had been reduced. On the other hand, it shows that effective authority over that area was a difficult task and evidently the most expedient course of action was to leave concessions to the vanni chiefs and to enlist their goodwill as indeed Vijayabāhu seems to have done. At any rate the control or restoration of the city of Anurādhapura to anything nearing its ancient glory was a task to which Vijayabāhu or any of his successors was hardly equal.

The greater interest taken in the restoration of the city of Polonnaruva is understandable. Prior to the foundation of Dambadeniya it was the capital from which the Sinhalese kings ruled. It was also the seat of authority of Māgha who was defeated after a protracted struggle. In fact the Dambadeni kings looked upon Polonnaruva as the basis of royal power (mūla rājadhāni).[2] This point is illustrated by

---

[1] Cv., LXXXVIII, 87-89; Pjv. adds the detail that the wives and children of these vanni kings seized by the Sinhalese kings in former times were restored to them, Pjv., 136.

[2] Pjv., 131, 136; Cv., LXXXVIII, 90.

Parākramabahu's desire to hold his consecration in Polonnaruva, even though he had been already consecrated at Jambuddoṇi on his accession to the throne.[1] We may compare the case of Vijayabāhu I, who held his consecration at Anurādhapura but preferred to rule from Polonnaruva. It would have given satisfaction to Parākramabāhu to hold his consecration in the old sacred capital from which his enemy, who had occupied Rājarattha for nearly half a century exercised authority. Besides it was perhaps considered to have symbolic importance, and it is likely to have aroused interest in the people for whom it was meant to have been a recognition of his victory over the Damilas. It appears therefore that Polonnaruva was conceived of as the seat of royal sovereignty, although these kings were resident in Dambadeniya.

The condition of Polonnaruva when Vijayabāhu entered it was not different from that of Anurādhapura. The Cūlavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya give a description of its pathetic condition, which may well be compared with the accounts of its grandeur which prevailed in the time of Parākramabāhu I.[2] The contrast is indeed more real than apparent. Under Māgha the city and its numerous and imposing buildings, both religious and secular, would hardly have received the attention they deserved. In the words put in the mouth of Vijayabāhu, the Cūlavaṃsa describes:

---

[1] Cv., LXXXVII, 70, LXXXII, 1-2; Pjv., 131-32.

[2] Cv., LXXXVIII, 90 ff; Pjv., 136-37; cf. Cv., LXXVIII, 44-109, LXXIX, 1-85.

> 'In the towncalled Pulatthinagara, there are now pāsādas, image houses, vihāras, parivenas, cetiyas, and relic temples, walls, gate towers, houses of the addha-yoga and of the hammiya kind, mandapas, sermon halls, temples to the deities and other buildings. Some of these stand erect, covered with grass, trees and whatever has grown upon them. Others have collapsed without support as the whole of their pillars perished; others again alas! will fall, bending under the weight of walls cracked from top to foot, because other support is wanting. Some of these through decay and old age are like grey beards, and unable to stand erect they become more bowed from day to day. With many the joists are broken and their pinnacles destroyed, with others the roofs have decayed and the bricks are broken. In others by the breakage of the damaged roof-tree the bricks of the roof-tree have fallen and only walls and pillars remain. In others again the gates have fallen in and the hinging of the gate-posts destroyed; in others again the steps have become loosened and the railings have fallen in. Of many all that can be seen are parts still hanging together from the original foundation wall. Of many not even the place where they once stood is now to be seen. Of what use are many words? This town which has lost all its glory we shall again make glorious.'[1]

We cite this long passage in order to illustrate that during many years of neglect, in which the island was menaced by repeated foreign invasions, the city of Polonnaruva as well as the civilisatinn of which it had become the centre had suffered severe adversities. In a tropical climate such as that prevailing in the Dry Zone of Ceylon in which this civilisation flourished, even the most solid buildings had to be kept in a constant state of repair, if they were to withstand the destructive impact of the scorching heat and rain. The numerous Sinhalese kings who in the past repaired and restored the numerous religious monuments in the

---

[1] Cv., LXXXVIII, 92-101.

sacred cities successively were doing so perhaps not entirely due to an exuberance of religious zeal, though no doubt it was an important consideration. It was evidently also a matter of practical necessity, if these structures were to withstand the ravages of the weather. Thus the description of the condition of Polonnaruva can well be taken as a fair picture of the decadence and decline which had set in 'in the devastated land, long desolate'.

Vijayabāhu, however, applied himself energetically to recreate even partially the lost splendour of the former capital. Parākramabāhu secured to him the assistance of the circle of ministers (mahāmaccamaṇḍala) in this task.[1] The services of various craftsmen such as workers in iron (ayakāra), bricklayers (iṭṭhikavaḍḍhakī), carpenters (dāruvaḍḍhakī) painters (cittakāra) and others were secured from different parts of the country.[2] The restored shrines and other edifices are not mentioned by name. We are told that the city was adorned with vihāras which were provided with their characteristic complements such as parks, bathing-ponds, maṇḍapas and pāsadas. The defences of this city such as its walls and moats were rebuilt. Apart from this, we are told that Vijaya-bāhu had the 'tanks, ponds, dykes pools and the like - in which the em-

---

[1] Cv., LXXXVIII, 103-104; Pjv., 137.

[2] Cv., LXXXVIII, 105-110; Pjv., 137. These passages contain a list of different occupations at the time, and the names of the tools and implements used by them.

bankment had given way, and which were deprived of their deep water dammed up as before, filled with deep water, covered with diverse lotus blossoms and stocked with all kinds of fish'.[1] Some attempt seems to have been made towards the promotion of agriculture by having 'all kinds of crops grown here and there and made the whole fair land prosperous'.[2] None of this, however, should create the impression that any effective measures were taken to repair the major irrigation works on a large scale, as these were tasks which required the expenditure of vast resources. Placed as they had been, in the grip of foreign invaders, these rulers would not have been able to meet the exacting demands of great resources, which were called for in the implementation of a programme for the systematic restoration of the irrigation works.

The description of the restored city is a piece of obvious exaggeration. 'In this fashion the king had the town of Pulatthinagara - comparable to the city of Indra - restored, so that it surpassed Mithilā, subdued Kāñcīpurī, laughed to scorn Sāvatthi, subdued Madhurā, turned to shame Bārāṇasī, reduced Vesālī to do nothing and made Campāpurī tremble with her glory.'[3] Compared with the earlier account, which probably was very near the actual state of the city at the time, it is beyond belief that Vijayabāhu could transform it to conform even remotely to the picture painted in the passage cited above. This would have meant

---

[1] Cv., LXXXVIII, 111-13; Pjv., 137-38; Pjv. 138 refers to the resettlement of that region with people: 'laksaganan manusyayangen mahajana gahana karavā'.

[2] Cv., LXXXVIII, 114-15; Pjv., 138.

[3] Cv., LXXXVIII, 121.

in practice the rebuilding of the entire city.

When the city was restored by repairing at least its more important buildings and other features Vijayabāhu made the necessary preparations for the performance of the royal consecration. Then Parākramabāhu was called into the restored city from Jambuddoṇi where he remained at the time and the consecration ceremony was performed which, it is stated, lasted seven days.[1] This was one of the cherished desires of Parakramabāhu, the achievement of which must have given him great personal joy. The performance of his royal consecration in the old capital must have appeared to the people as an acclamation of the defeat of the Damiḷa and Jāvaka enemies with whom he waged a long-drawn struggle. Consequently, it is likely to have given an understandable degreeof joy both to the king and his subjects.

The next important task before Vijayabāhu was the restoration of the Tooth Relic to its sacred temple in the old capital. We have already seen the circumstances under which it had been brought to Māyārat̤ṭha for reasons of safety when Māgha occupied Rājarat̤ṭha.[2] It had since remained first at Beligala and later at Dambadeṇiya where Vijayabāhu III and Parākramabāhu II erected temples in which they were deposited.[3] The Cūḷavaṃsa and the Pūjāvaliya contain a picturesque description of the festivity amidst which the relics were taken to the old capital before

A

[1] Pjv., 138; Cv., LXXXIX, 7-10.

[2] See above, 229-33.

[3] See above, 264-66.

they were enshrined in its traditional temple.[1] The highway from Jambuddoṇi was gaily decorated, and the relics-bearing chariot is stated to have passed along it, accompanied by the five-fold music (pañcatūryanāda), singing and dancing, amidst the tumultous joy of the people. The procession consisted of the king and his retinue, princes (rāja), nobles (rājañāa), councillors (mantī), warriors (yodha), the lay devotees and the Saṃgha.[2] Having thus brought the relics, they were deposited in the traditional temple at an auspicious moment set apart for it. The festival is said to have concluded after paying great homage to the relics. The elaborate ritual followed in the Tooth Relic festivals is detailed in the Daḷadasirita.[3] No doubt the Tooth Relic festivals were celebrated in great enthusiasm and these were occasions when practically every section of society gathered together in piety and devotion.[4]

It is not stated in any of our sources that the Tooth Relic was brought back to Dambadeṇiya at the end of these celebrations. Indeed one gets the impression that it was permanently deposited in its traditional shrine in Poḷonnaruvā. But this would seem strange, for it was customary to have the relic enshrined in a temple close to the royal

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIX, 13 ff.; Pjv. 139 states that the Tooth Relic Temple in Poḷonnaruva had been desolate for sixty four years; this is probably a conventional figure; Dal. S., 45.

[2] Cv., LXXXIX, 24-27.

[3] Dal. S., 46-54.

[4] Geiger, Cult. Cey. Med. Times, 213 ff., W. Rahula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, 280-82.

residence. However, it is clear from a later passage in the Cūlavaṃsa where it is stated that Aryacakravarti, who invaded Ceylon in or shortly after the reign of Bhuvanekabāhu I, sacked Subhagiri and carried away the Tooth Relic and other treasures to the Pāṇḍya country. It is therefore clear, as Geiger has pointed out, that the Tooth Relic had been brought to Subhagiri by Vijayabāhu's successor.[1] Apart from the desire to have the Relic close to the royal residence, this would point to the insecurity which prevailed in Rājaraṭṭha.

Vijayabāhu directed his mind to the performance of the festival for the admission to the Order (upasampadāmaṅgala). This was perhaps even more important than the restoration of the shrine viewed from the point of the welfare of the Sāsana. The Vinaya rules for the discipline of the Saṃgha underline in no uncertain terms how vital it is to hold this ceremony in the proper manner.[2] Successive Sinhalese kings devoted their attention to see that facilities were provided for its performance. The Upasampadā ceremony fell into abeyance when Buddhism was forced to hardships, especially in times of foreign invasions. Vijayabāhu I invited monks from Rāmañña so that the ceremony of admission to the Order could be reinstituted.[3]

---

[1] Cv., xc, 43-47; Cv. Tr., II, 204, note 3.

[2] Vinaya, I, P.T.S., 1879, 21 ff., 55 ff., 71-95.

[3] Cv., LX, 5-8; Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 40, p. 252, lines 5-11, tr. 253.

Parākramabāhu I also took interest in this matter and his Katikāvata (edict) contains information on the manner in which it should be performed.[1] Vijayabāhu III similarly invited the members of the Order who had fled to South India in the time of Māgha's sack of Rājaraṭṭha and had them perform this ceremony.[2] Parākramabāhu II, we are told, had this ceremony performed eight times in his 3rd, 6th, 11th, 12th, 17th, 21st, 27th and 30th years respectively.[3] However, Parākramabāhu appears to have had a great desire to have this ceremony performed in its traditional site at Sahassatitta (Dāstoṭa), a ford to the south of Polonnaruva, located on the Mahavāli Ganga. This was one of the tasks entrusted to Vijayabāhu when he took over the administration of the kingdom.[4] And now Vijayabāhu made arrangements to have the Upasampadā performed at Sahassatittha as requested by his father.

The especial emphasis given to this ceremony by Parākramabāhu was necessitated by the abuses and corruption that had been going on in the Samgha. The Dambadeni Katikavata which embodies the code of disciplinary rules issued during his reign reflects very clearly not only the indiscipline of the monks in a variety of ways, but indicates that such abuses had crept into the manner in which this import-

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., II, no. 41, 256-83; Cv., LXXVIII, 12-27 contains a graphic description of the corruption and disunity in the Samgha.

[2] Pjv., 109-110; Cv., LXXXI, 49-50; Nks., 87-88, Dal. S., 43-44.

[3] Pjv., 123; Cv., LXXXIV, 32-37.

[4] Cv., LXXXVII, 71-72.

ant ceremony was conducted. It lays down that:

> 'The ceremony of admission to the Order is an act of first rate importance for the stability of the Dispensation and the ceremony of admission to the Order should not be performed except in the presence of the Śāsanānusāsaka ('the Head of the Buddhist Community'), or with those who are proficient in the Discipline as are appointed by the latter, and with royal authority, but not in various places'.[1]

Now this shows that the ceremony had been performed in contravention of the disciplinary rules applicable to it. Thus repeated performance of this ceremony through the patronage of Parākramabahu II, as well as the efforts of his predecessors was an attempt to deal with the growing indiscipline in the Saṃgha. The earlier ceremonies of the Upasampadā which Parakramabāhu caused to be performed were probably local in scope. This time, however, we are told that the monks of the whole island gathered at Sahassatittha for the performance of the ceremony of admission to the Order.[2] The vanni kings of Patiṭṭharaṭṭha (Rājaraṭṭha) and Rohaṇa are said to have brought with them the requisite provisions of alms for the assembly of monks who gathered at Sahassatittha.[3]

At this ceremony held at Sahassatittha many monks are said to have

---

[1] Upasampadāva nam Śāsanasthitiyaṭa mul vū garukarmmayak bävin tatkālaśāsanānusāsaka tän mädavä hō etän visin äṇavana lada vyakta vinayadharayan ätiva rajasammatayen misa nā nā sthānayehi upasampadava nokaṭa yutu, Damadeni Katikavata, see Ktk. Sng., 10.

[2] Cv., LXXXIX, 57-59; Pjv., 139-40.

[3] Cv., LXXXIX, 51-53; Pjv., 139.

received the higher ordination. The deserving theras were invested with the different ranks such as that of the Grand Master (mahāsāmi-padaṃ), Chief Thera (mūlapadaṃ), Grand Thera (mahāthera padaṃ), and Pariveṇa Thera (parivenatherapadaṃ).[1] The ceremony is stated to have lasted for a period of half a month (addhamāsaṃ). It is interesting to note that at the conclusion of the ceremony, 'he (Parākramabāhu) sent many remaining articles of use to the bhikkhus settled in the Paṇḍu and Coḷa countries'.[2] It is an indication of the cordial religious intercourse between Ceylon and the Damiḷ country which prevailed during this period - a fact to which we have already drawn attention.

So far as the outcome of the efforts of Parākramabāhu II to bring about the 'purification' of the Saṃgha is concerned, we may well say that the results were not lasting, as had been the case with the efforts of his predecessors in this direction. The promulgation of similar edicts concerning the discipline of the Saṃgha not long after the reign of Parākramabāhu II by his successors, indicates the limited nature of the results of the efforts of this monarch.[3] It is, however, important to bear in mind that Parākramabāhu devoted his attention and energy to improve the discipline of the Order in order to further the welfare of the Dispensation at a time when royal patronage was most urgently needed,

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIX, 64-65; Pjv., 140.

[2] Depōyakin mālukam pūjāva nimavā, Pjv., 140; Cv., LXXXIX, 63, 67-68.

[3] Nks., 90, 94, 96; Cv., XCI, 9-11.

irrespective of what success he achieved.

After these ceremonies were over Parākramabāhu returned to Dambadeniya and the administration of the Northern Province (Uttara Raṭṭha) had been entrusted to Vīrabāhu who took up his residence in Polonnaruva.[1] How long he continued there or what fate ultimately overtook him is not known.

And that brings us to the end of the long and eventful reign of Parākramabāhu II which is recorded in complimentary language in the Cūlavaṃsa: 'After he had for a long time made over the burden of government to his own world-famed son, this most excellent King Parakkamabāhu who as described, performed through his son an abundance of meritorious works, entered heaven when he had attained his thirty-fifth year (of reign)[2]'. There is no reason to doubt that his reign lasted thirty-five years, for the Pūjāvaliya too refers to his thirty-fifth regnal year in which the Upasampadā ceremony at Sahassatittha is stated to have been held, though his death is not specifically mentioned.[3]

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIX, 11; the expression is raṭṭhaṃ uttamaṃ which Geiger rightly thinks is a reference to Rājaraṭṭha, Cv. Tr., II, 194, note 3; This is confirmed by the Pūjāvaliya: Kandavurupurehi dī abhiṣēka maṅgul karavā Vīrabāhu rajahaṭa ē siyalu rājyaya ma pāvā dī ovun ehi raṅdavā', Pjv. 138.

[2] Cv., LXXXIX, 71; Rjv., 46 gives thirty two years.

[3] The text of the Pūjāvaliya which Geiger consulted seems to give the length of Parākramabāhu's reign as thirty three years, Cv. Tr., II, p.200, note 2; but see the improved recent edition of this text (Suravīra), 140, mesē mē pantis vannehi karanalada Vijayabāhu mālukam pūjāvak karavā tumū ema Jambudroṇi nam purayehi tava da vaḍa vaḍā putrayan viṅdinā śrī sampat bala balā tavada vaḍa vaḍa pin rās koṭa rajasiri viṅdināha'.

Quite clearly, his death occured in his thirty-fifth regnal year, though the Rājāvaliya places this event in his thirty-second year.[1]

Before we wind up this chapter it would be appropriate to draw attention to some of the more noteworthy features of the period covered by the reign of Parākramabāhu II. One fact which stands out clearly is that the major part of his reign was marred by his struggle with foreign invaders, namely Māgha, the Pāṇḍyas and Candrabhānu. His task was indeed a very difficult one. He made determined efforts to maintain the integrity of the province of Māyāraṭṭha and to extend his authority into Rājaraṭṭha, the traditional seat of Sinhalese royal power. Here, of course, we have to bear in mind that in these efforts it was his nephew Vīrabāhu, and his sons, particularly Vijayabāhu who carried the practical burden of organising and leading the defence of the kingdom in the face of repeated foreign invasions. We have to agree with Paranavitana when he says: 'What ever the qualities for which this monarch deserves our esteem, capacity as a leader in warfare was not one of them and he was not cast in the same heroic mould as his predecessors whose

---

[1] The Cūlavaṃsa refers to his death in the thirty fifth year, LXXXIX, 71; the Pūjāvaliya passage quoted above states that the king was resident in Jambuddoṇi in his thirty fifth year enjoying the happiness of the success of his sons, 140. Some manuscripts of this text, however, end with the statement that Parākramabāhu entrusted the kingdom to his eldest son Vijayabāhu and that he ruled thirty two years: jyeṣṭha vū Vijayabāhu nam put raja haṭa rājyaya bhāra kota dī tumū deṭis āvuruddak rājyaya kaḷaha'. Puj., 140, note 11. The Aluṭnuvara Devālaya Karavīma, however, mentions his death in the thirty second year, British Museum Library, manuscript No. Or. 6606(145).

achievements he desired to emulate'.[1] It is evident that he was not made of the fighting fibre which the realities of the times demanded, but we would be too harsh towards this monarch if his importance is allowed to diminish on that account.

Though he did not figure in the battle field, as for example Vīrabāhu and Vijayabāhu did when the occasion demanded, nevertheless it appears that Parākramabāhu was a source of inspiration.[2] And one could see in this troubled time: a remarkable degree of unity and peacein the royal family. We have seen how the members of the royal family - each one of them went out to play their part in the defence strategy. We have indeed hardly any evidence that personal ambition or sectarian considerations deflected them from their cause. It is a remarkable feature, for it continued right through the reign of Parākramabāhu of over three decades. Whatever be the limitations under which these rulers struggled there is reason to believe that the unity which prevailed in the royal family in some measure added to, rather than weakened, their position.

In this reign of repeated foreign invasions which caused so much confusion even natural calamities set in. We have seen that Parākramabāhu himself was afflicted with an incurable disease from his twenty-second year onwards.[3] There is also a reference to a famine which oc-

---

[1] U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 618.

[2] Cv., LXXXVIII, 29 ff.

[3] Sinh. Sā. Lipi, 'Alutnuvara Dēvālaya Karavīma', 67; see above.

cured during his reign:

> 'Now once upon a time when through the influence of evil planets, a great heat arose in Laṅkā by which everything was burnt up, when the corn withered up and a famine was inevitable and the whole of the people dwelling in Laṅkā were filled with the greatest anxiety, the king gave orders for a splendid festival to be held for the three sacred objects, for the cetiyas and the bodhi trees and for the protection of Metteya and other miracle-working deities who were to be venerated by various offerings and even to turn the whole of Laṅkā into one great festival.'[1]

We are told that famine was warded off by the recitation of Paritta and by paying homage to the Tooth Relic, a practice which survives to this day as a means of overcoming natural calamities.[2]

The date of this famine is not recorded, but it is referred to in the chapter dealing with 'The Handing over of the Burden of Dominion'. It is possible, therefore, that it took place about the time when Vijayabāhu was entrusted with the administration. However, this famine is not unique, for similar calamities occured both before and after his reign.[3] But such an unfortunate visitation at a time when these princes were committed to bitter struggle with foreign invaders is likely to have proved a considerable setback to their war efforts. It was amidst these difficulties that Parākramabāhu had to face powerful adventurers like Māgha and Candrabhānu, who successfully

---

[1] Cv., LXXXVII, 1-4; Pjv., 128.

[2] Cv., LXXXVII, 4-13.

[3] For a tradition concerning a famine in the reign of Vaṭṭa Gāmaṇī Abhaya see Sammohavinodanī 448-50 for other famines see Mv., XXXVI, 74-79; Cv., XXXVII, 189-198; XC, 43; Cv. Tr., II, 204, note 1.

carved out portions of northern territory for themselves, as well as the impact of the imperial power of the Pāṇḍyas, who were desirous of extending their influence into Ceylon. At the same time it was not easy to keep vanni kings under control, and there is sufficient indication that they in fact proved refractory.[1] One has to take into account these difficulties in order to understand the magnitude of the problems Parākramabāhu was faced with.

We have shown that towards the end of his reign Parākramabāhu succeeded in extending his control into Rajaraṭṭha, and that was at the end of a bitter and protracted struggle. Similarly this 'victory' was symbolised in his consecration which he held in the old capital of Polonnaruva. But these attempts do not seem to have led to a permanent occupation or a lasting reclamation of Rājaraṭṭha. The treatment meted out to the vanni kings in Rājaraṭṭha suggests that for all practical purposes, they were independent chiefs, but for a possible nominal acknowledgment of the supremacy of the Dambadeni kings. We are told that when they came to show their respects to Vijayabāhu in the city of Anurādhapura, bringing with them presents to the king Vijayabahu also presented them with 'rocking chairs, fly-whisks, and other insignia for the great kings of the vanni people' and entrusted them

---

[1] Pjv., 136; Parākramabāhu VI is also stated to have defeated the vanni kings, Girāsandeśaya, verse 140 See also Pärakumbā-Sirita, verse 28.

with the protection of the city of Anurādhapura.[1] The Pūjāvaliya states that Vijayabāhu returned to these vanni kings their wives and children previously captured in war and retained as hostages.[2] This shows that often force had to be used if these were to be kept under control, for they would not have tolerated any interference in their domains, by the Dambadeṇi kings.

After Parākramabāhu's death his son Vijayabāhu, who had already been in control of the administration for many years, succeeded to the throne and ruled from Jambuddoṇi for a brief two years at the end of which his reign came to a tragic end.[3] His successor Bhuvanekabāhu I (1272-84) remained at Jambuddoṇi for a few years but later moved to Subhagiri where he set up his seat of authority.[4] Among the latter's successors, Parākramabahu III (1287-93) reigned at Poḷonnaruva for a brief period, and after that this ancient city is never mentioned again in the Cūḷavaṃsa and had evidently passed into oblivion.[5]

---

[1] Cv., LXXXVIII, 87-89; Pjv., 136.

[2] Pihiṭi rajayehi mahavannīn taman giyahayi asā bhaya ätiva avut dänvū kalhi ovunṭa prasāda dī pera noekvara yuddhayehi ovungen alvā kastira koṭagat aṁbudaruvanudu pāvā di ovun nuvara rakinā se ārakṣāvehi niyukta koṭa esidu piya rajuṭa danvā yavā, Pjv., 136.

[3] Cv., XC, 1-3.

[4] Daḷ. S., 45; Cv., XC, 34-35.

[5] Cv., XC, 48-58.

Even in Rohaṇa there is no clear indication that his authority was effectively exercised. Among the numerous religious foundations established by Parākramabāhu or among the vihāras and shrines repaired, no reference is made to any such activity in Rohaṇa. The only time Rohaṇa is mentioned is when its vanni chiefs are said to have come with provisions for alms, for the Upasampadā festival held at Sahassatittha.[1] In all probability, the control of Rohaṇa remained in the hands of these vanni chiefs, who acknowledged nominally at least the supremacy of the Daṁbadeṇi kings. Annual gifts to Daṁbadeṇi kings and their assistance in important functions such as the Upasampadā ceremony referred to above possibly amounted to an acknowledgment of that supremacy.

There is no doubt that Parākramabāhu had a fair control over Māyāraṭṭha. During his reign the minister Devapatirāja, yuvarāja Bhuvanekabāhu and his son Vijayabāhu carried out numerous activities, as stated earlier, in southern, south western and central Ceylon. The Pali Chronicles and Sinhalese literary works give a fairly detailed account of these activities.[2] It is reasonable to conclude that Parākramabāhu's authority was effective in these regions. This is confirmed by a few inscriptions datable in his reign. The Devundara inscription of this monarch, which lays down rules for the elimination of abuses in the administration of the port there, is located on the coast

---

[1] Pjv., 139; Cv., LXXXIX, 51-53.

[2] Cv., LXXXV-LXXXVIII; Pjv., 122-36.

in the extreme south of Ceylon. It refers to his defeat of the Tamils and goes on to state that he was the ruler of the whole island implied in his title, Trisiṃhaḷādhīśvara (Lord of the three Siṃhaḷas viz., Ruhuṇu, Māyā and Pihiṭi).[1] Another inscription of a Parākramabāhu dated in his 30th regnal year, styled Sirisaṅgabo Prākramabāhu Cakravarti Syāmīnvahanse is found at the Galapāta Vihāra, situated at a distance of two miles from the Bentota Rest House, in the Valallāviṭi Kōralē in the Southern Province. The location is thus very close to the south coast, half way between Colombo and Galle. Paranavitana has argued that the inscription should be attributed to Parākramabāhu I, as against the earlier views held by Muller and Bell, who had assigned to Parakramabāhu II.[2] The real difficulty in determining the ruler who figures in this record, as pointed out by Paranavitana, is that paleographic considerations can be of little assistance, for the time separating the reigns of these two rulers is too small to lead to noticeable paleographic developments to be reflected in the records of the period. Similarly the titles of the king mentioned in it can well be applied to both these monarchs. There is no criterion by which the ruler can be identified beyond doubt with either Parākramabāhu I or II. However, on the arguments given by Paranavitana, though by no means conclusive, this inscription may be tentatively attributed to Parākramabāhu I.[3]

---

[1] A.S.C., Mem. VI, (1953), 63-70.

[2] Ep. Zeyl., IV, No. 25., 196-211; For the views of Muller and Bell see, Ancient Inscriptions of Ceylon, No. 165; No. 165; J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., July, 1914, pp. lxix-lxxvii.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., IV, 205-11.

As for its contents, it records the foundation of the Galapāta Vihāra by a dignitary named Mindal (Mahendra) who held the office of Demeḷa adhikāra and was in charge of the administration of the Pasyodun (Pañcayojana) District. He had the royal assent for the construction of this vihāra, in which he had the co-operation of his mother and certain other relatives. The record gives a long list of lands and serfs granted to the vihāra and ends with the signatures of the donors and the witnesses. This record adds, however, very little information to our knowledge of the political events of the period with which we have been chiefly concerned, though it is certainly a valuable source of information for a study of the social conditions, especially the institution of slavery in relation to its prevalence in the Buddhist monasteries of medieval Ceylon.[1]

Another inscription of Parākramabahu II has come to light from Nāranbädda, a village situated at a distance of two miles from the Raṁbukkana Railway Station, in the Deyāladahamuna Pattuva, Kinigoḍa Kōrale of the Kāgalla District.[2] It refers to Parakramabāhu's defeat of 'the Damiḷas who came to destroy the Māyā kingdom', the recovery of the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl, and the protection given to these relics and the Saṃgha. Further, it records the construction of the Sela vihāra (i.e. Rock Monastery) which was named after him as Parākramabāhu Pirivaṇa, to which certain lands were granted. The record

---

[1] Ep. Zeyl., IV, 197-201.

[2] H.C.P.Bell, Rep. Kg. Dt., (1892), 77-78.

is undated, but there cannot be any doubt that it belongs to Parākramabahu II. Bell comments on this record: 'The allusion to the Tamil invasion, and the recovery of the Relics, together with the style and character in which the inscription is written justifies its ascription to Parākramabāhu III'.[1] Bell means Parākramabāhu II evidently, and the third ruler of that name is mentioned by a printer's error. This scholar is right in identifying the piriveṇa mentioned therein with that built by Parākramabāhu as stated in the Cūlavaṃsa: 'Thereupon the king erected a pariveṇa that was called by his name Parakkamabāhu, adorned with lofty pāsādas granted the vihāra diverse objects of use suited to it as well as rich maintenance villages and celebrated a great sacrificial festival'.[2]

One more inscription belonging to the reign of Parākramabāhu II has come to light from Tuttirivela in Yāpahu.[3] The record refers to the twenty-ninth year of Sirisaṅgabo Parākramabāhu. It records a grant of land (to a vihāra?) by the two brothers Vijayabāhu and Bhuvanekabāhu. The identification of these royal personages present no difficulty. The king in whose regnal year the record is dated is Parākramabāhu II and Vijayabāhu and Bhuvanekabāhu who are referred to as 'brothers' (debāyan)

---

[1] Bell, Rep. Kg. Dt., 77. Svastiśrīnavarat /nādhi/ pativū Parakramabāhu svāmi māyārajaya nasanta ā Demaḷun (parāja koṭa) daḷadā pātradhātun-vahanse da mahāsaṃghayāvahan /se/(va) da rāka.

[2] Cv., LXXXV, 57-58.

[3] Bell, A.S.C.A.R., 1911-12, 63. Sirisaṅgabo Parakramabāhu svāmīnṭa visinavavanu Vijayabāhu svāmīn hā Bhuvanekabāhu svāmīn hā debāyan vahanse.

are his two sons who bore those names. We know that Bhuvanekabāhu was stationed at Yāpahu to safeguard the defence of the kingdom against any invasion from the North, and therefore the discovery of this record in its vicinity is not surprising.[1]

Bell refers to an inscription from the village of Bēruvala, in the Beligal Kōralē of the Kāgalla District, which mentions a king named Parākramabāhu.[2] The text of this inscription remains unpublished, but Bell has assigned it to Parākramabāhu I or Parākramabāhu II. We may also take into account the construction of the Dēvālaya at Alutnuvara in the Galboḍa Kōralē of the Kāgalla District, referred to in the document known as the Alutnuvara Dēvālaya Karavīma already cited.[3]

Joseph Pearson refers to a copper plate, dated in the year 1809 of the Buddhist era, which records a grant of land by king Parākramabāhu of Daṁbadeṇiya.[4] At the time this plate came to the notice of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon it was in the possession of the chief thera of the Rajamahā Vihāra at Viḥāragama in the Daṁbadeṇi Hatpattu. Pearson doubts the authenticity of this record: 'It professes to be a grant of Parākramabāhu II of Daṁbadeṇiya and is dated in the year 1809 of the Buddhist era, but the script and the language in which the document

---

[1] Cv., LXXXVIII, 23-26.

[2] A.S.C.A.R., 1911-12, see list of inscriptions on p. 122, No. 256.

[3] A part of this work is published by Sir D. B. Jayatilaka in his Simhala Sāhitya Lipi, 67-68. A complete manuscript is available at the British Museum Library, Or. 6606 (145), 12 leaves.

[4] A.S.C.A.R., 1931, page 6.

is written betrays its spuriousness'.[1]

The provenance and the contents of the inscriptions considered above, taken along with the accounts of Parākramabāhu's activities as given in the Sinhalese and Pali sources would lead to the inference that his authority was effective in Māyāraṭṭha. The Cūlavaṃsa and other Chronicles would have us believe that Parākramabāhu II unified the three kingdoms and brought them under his dominion.[2] So does the Devundara Inscription which refers to him as Trisiṃhalādhīśvara. These claims, however, cannot be taken seriously. The diminishing sphere of royal authority did not prevent the eulogists from attributing to their patrons much more greatness than their achievements warranted. The high-sounding epithets with which Parākramabāhu IV (1302-1326) is referred to by the author of the Daḷadāsirita may serve as a fine example:

> 'Sūryavaṃśāvataṃsa Laṅkāṅganāvallabha navaratnādhipati, Trisiṃhalādhīśvara, bhujagapatibhogabāhu, raṇadharaṇīsahasrabāhu, pararājarhubāhu, ājānulambabāhu, anavaratadānadhārardhrabāhu, dhanadadanāpahāsabāhu, tribhuvanaikabāhu, śrīlīlābhavanabāhu, ratnatraāpacitisamucitabāhu, viśvāmbharāsambharaṇodyatabāhu, dharālatāvatīrṇasantānabāhu, nikhilajanasukṛta parināmabāhu, parākramabāhu, Śrī Parākrama nam äti, rājādhirājaparameśvara, rājakulakaustubharāja, rājakulacintāratna, rājakulaśekhara rājakulakalpadṛma vū rājacandrakenek Śrī Laṅkādvīpaya eksat käru...'[3]

---

[1] A.S.C.A.R., 1931, page 6.

[2] Cv., LXXXVII, 24-25; Dravida Kerala Yāvakādī viyavul sanhiṅduvā sakala Lamkātalaya hastagatakoṭa, Dambadeni Katikavata, see Ktk. Sng., 8, Nks., 88.

[3] Dal. S., 47.

These epithets or the eulogistic tone in which the kings are referred to in some of these works can be little more than the poetic fancy on the part of the eulogists, and can hardly be taken as a reflection of actual political power. In fact with the dwindling of royal authority to a limited sphere, such eulogistic claims became even more commonplace in the writings of this period. This difficulty is also found in the accounts of Parākramabāhu II. But there is sufficient reason to believe that his authority was effective in Māyāraṭṭha. We have already shown that his authority was possibly less effective in Rohaṇa.

The 'conquest' of Rājaraṭṭha does not appear to have resulted in a permanent annexation or occupation. After the defeat of Candrabhānu, Parākramabāhu succeeded no doubt in extending his control into this traditional seat of Sinhalese royal authority, but it appears to have lasted for a brief period only. Indeed Paranavitana has shown after a critical examination of the Sinhalese, Tamil and Pali sources that the Tamil Kingdom in the north of Ceylon originated in this period.[1] Of Polonnaruva and Anuradhapura nothing is recorded in the Chronicles in the later period. Several centuries later, however, with the revival of Buddhism under Kīrttiśrī Rajasimha, we are told that this monarch visited the sacred shrines and made offerings to them. This was no more than a pilgrimage to the desolate shrines on the part of

---

[1] 'The Ārya Kingdom in the North of Ceylon', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS., VII, 174-224.

king.[1] The last time Polonnaruva is mentioned in the Cūlavaṃsa is in its account of Parakramabāhu III (1287-93).[2] The ancient royal cities of Rājaraṭṭha with all their Buddhist monuments as well as the network of irrigation works, which embody the achievements of the Sinhalese civilisation over the centuries, finally gave way before the progressive advance of the jungle tide.

In these circumstances the claims of Parākramabāhu II to have effected the unification of the country have to be taken with the necessary reservations. This will, no doubt, bring us to a grasp of the limited success he achieved compared with the achievements of his illustrious predecessors such as Vijayabāhu I or Parākramabāhu I in the political field. But as we have already shown one has to bear in mind the particularly difficult circumstances under which he worked. Apart from the repeated invasions by foreign enemies he was also faced with natural calamities. On the other hand the neglect of the irrigation works in Rājaraṭṭha during the rule of foreign invaders, and the consequent decline in agricultural production on which was dependent a large part of the royal revenue, meant that he had to face these invaders when the state coffers had suffered considerably. Even if Parākramabāhu was not a warrior and lacked the warlike qualities which the times demanded, certainly his nephew Vīrabāhu and sons like Vijayabāhu made amends for it when they went out to battle each time the country

---

[1] Cv., XCIX, 36-37.

[2] Cv., XC, 55-56.

was invaded, and displayed courage and determination in their efforts to rid the country of foreign rule. What is perhaps most important to note is that even though their success in the political sphere was necessarily limited, they waged a protracted struggle against these invaders, and were able to maintain their authority in at least a good part of the Island. In Māyāraṭṭha the people and the Saṃgha were thus given a degree of peace and protection certainly remarkable when viewed in the light of the stark realities of the troubled history of the island during this period. This spell of comparative peace was particularly welcome at this time and Buddhism recovered from the plight in which it had been. And arts and letters flourished in these parts of the island, benefiting from the peace and patronage given by the Daṃbadeṇi kings.

The foreign invasions and the consequent political confusion did not prevent the Daṃbadeṇi kings from extending their patronage to Buddhism. In spite of these adversities the kings took a keen interest in restoring the position of Buddhism, which had suffered heavily during the rule of foreign invaders. It is outside the scope of the present study to examine in detail the various activities undertaken in the field of religion and the notable results they produced, which were not confined to the religious sphere. It was undoubtedly a productive period in the field of literature and learning, testified to by the numerous works written by the writers who flourished in this period.[1]

---

[1] For an account of the writers and the literature of this period, Degammäda Sumanajoti Thera, Daṃbadeṇi Yugaya, 209-324.

We propose to note in brief some of the noteworthy developments in these spheres, reserving a detailed investigation for a future occasion.

We have already referred to the recall of the learned theras who had taken shelter in the countries of the Pāṇḍyas and the Coḷas during these adverse times. New vihāras were founded and the dilapidated shrines and residences were repaired in various parts of the country where their authority prevailed. The endowments of the vihāras, consisting of the villages, lands etc. seized by 'the alien foe' were restored to them.[1] An attempt was made to eliminate the abuses which prevailed in the conduct of the Saṃgha, by the issue of edicts (katikāvatas) through the co-operation of the chief dignitaries of the Order. Apart from the attempts made by Vijayabāhu III in this direction, the Dambadeṇiy Katikāvata issued during the reign of Parākramabāhu II bears ample evidence of the steps taken by the latter. This katikāvata is a very valuable source of information for a study of the condition of the Saṃgha during this period.[2] The leading theras of the two chief communities of monks at the time, namely the Grāmavasī and the Vanavāsī, co-operated with the Dambadeṇi kings in their efforts to improve the discipline and unity in the Buddhist Order. This is confirmed by nearly all our principal sources.[3] Similarly, the recovery of

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIV, 3-4; for an account of the monasteries of this period see Daṃbadeṇi Yugaya, 127-144.

[2] The purification of the Saṃgha and the issue of this edict is stated in several principal sources: Pjv., 118; Cv., LXXXI, 7-8; Nks., 88-89; Dal.S., 44-45; for the text of this edict see, Sir D.B.Jayatilaka, Katikāvat Saṅgarā, 6-20.

[3] Cv., LXXXI, 17 ff; Nks., 88-89; Ktk.Sng., 8-9; Dal.S., 43-45. Sdh.Rtn., 313-14.

the Tooth Relic and the Alms Bowl was an important event - certainly in the eyes of the Buddhist people who held them in the highest veneration. These measures taken by the Daṁbadeṇi kings not only gave the Saṃgha an appreciable degree of relief after a period of hardships and suffering, but the peace thus given enabled its members to devote a good part of their time to the studyof the Dhamma and to the writing of books devoted to its exposition. The result was a prolific literature, written both in Pali and Sinhalese and to lesser extent in Sanskrit.[1] The quantitative output of literary works in this period is remarkable, and even from qualitative considerations quite a few of them, indeed, reached a high degree of artistic and literary excellence. The Saṃgha and some of the lay writers were thus enabled to continue the high literary traditions of the age of Parākramabāhu I, irrespective of, if not unhampered by, the political confusion which characterised this period.

It is clear from the Daṁbadeṇi Katikāvata that the attainments of the average monk in the doctrines was lamentably low,[2] a factor which is also known from the Katikāvata issued in the reign of Parākramabāhu I.[3] Similarly, Vijayabāhu III is stated to have lamented that 'on the island of Laṅkā that so many books that dealt with the true

---

[1] On the Pali Literature of this period see Sugatadāsa Karuṇāratna, 'Dambadeṇi Samayē Pāli Sāhityaya', Sāhityaya, Dambadeṇi Kalāpaya, (1958), 97-108; on Sanskrit Literature, see Moraṭuvē Sāsanaratana, 109-121.

[2] Ktk. Sng., 10-11.

[3] Ep. Zeyl., II, No. 41, pp. 256-83.

doctrine had been destroyed by the alien foe' - a statement which is in agreement with the charge levelled against Māgha that 'many books known and famous they tore from their cord and strewed them hither and thither'.[1] Vijayabāhu made an attempt to improve the position by taking measures calculated to promote the knowledge of the Dhamma in the Saṃgha. We are told that

> 'the Ruler called together laymen endowed with a good memory and with knowledge, pious, well instructed, free from indolence and skilled in quick and fair writing, and along with these many other writers of books and made all these write down in careful fashion the eighty four thousand divisions of the doctrine and made over to them in accordance with the number of divisions the like number of gold kahāpaṇas'.[2]

Parākramabāhu II was also alive to this need and he appointed his brother Bhuvanekabāhu to look after the ecclesiastical affairs of the Saṃgha, and in particular to encourage and supervise the instruction of the bhikkhus in the doctrines.[3] We are further informed that

> 'With the reflection that theras who were acquainted with the sacred texts were rare in the island, he had all books brought from Jambudīpa, had many bhikkhus instructed in the sacred texts as also in all sciences such as philosophy and grammar and the like and made of them cultivated people'.[4]

---

[1] Cv., LXXX, 67 and LXXXI, 41.

[2] Cv., LXXXI, 41-45; Pjv., 110.

[3] Cv., LXXXIV, 29-31; Pjv., 119; Nks., 89: tamangē sahōdara mal vā Bhuvanekabāhu āpānan lavā bohō mahaṇa gaṇayāṭa asana tan kiyavū.

[4] Cv., LXXXIV, 26-27; Pjv., 119.

He also invited learned bhikkhus from the Cola country.[1] Such measures as the ones referred to above undoubtedly promoted learning and scholarship in the Order. As a result several Buddhist vihāras of the time, such as those at the Puṭabhattasela, Vātagiri, and the Vijayasunderārāma in Jambuddoṇi became important centres of learning and productive intellectual activity.[2]

In the first place, these efforts resulted in an active study of the Buddhist doctrine, by analysing and examining the works of previous authors. Commentaries and subcommentaries and glossaries came to be written in order to facilitate a better understanding of the sacred texts.[3] The Visuddhimārga Mahā Sannaya, a Sinhalese translation of the Visuddhimagga, by Parākramabāhu II himself, is an illustration of the vigorous intellectual activity in this period.[4] This work is not a mere translation of the original text but provides comments and explanations which bear ample testimony to the author's profound knowledge of the developments in other schools of Buddhist thought than the one to which he subscribed. Scholars like Godakumbura and Sorata Thera have drawn attention to his keen awareness of the works

---

[1] Cv., LXXXIV, 9-10.

[2] On these vihāras and their learned incumbents see Dambadeni Yugaya, 127-44, 162-181.

[3] For a survey of the Pali and Sinhalese Literary works, see Dambadeni Yugaya, 244 ff.

[4] Ed. Bentara Śraddhā Tisya (Reprinted in 1955); For Dharmaratna edition see Bibliography.

of reputed Indian scholars. Well known works like the Saundarānanda of Aśvaghosa, Abhidharmakośa of Vasubandhu are cited, and many other authors are quoted, some of whose works are not extant now, often refuting their arguments to substantiate his stand-point on doctrinal questions.[1] There cannot be any doubt about the wide learning of the author of this important work.

Apart from works of a philosophical nature several writers of this period brought out voluminous works of a popular nature extolling the virtues of the Buddha. The Pūjāvaliya (The History of Offerings), written by Mayurapāda thera, the Head of the Mayurapāda Pirivena is one of the best examples of this class of literature.[2] The Saddharmaratanāvaliya of Dharmasena, which is a Sinhalese translation of the Pali Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā is assigned to this period. It is written in easy prose, and the author has taken liberties to draw heavily from the then current folk lore and similies and parables intelligible to the unerudite readers. And thus the translation is not restricted to a rendering into Sinhalese of the original work.[3] The simple prose written for the easy comprehension of the readers is an important stage in the

---

[1] C. E. Godakumbura, Sinh.Lit., 43-45; 'References to Buddhist Sanskrit writers in Sinhalese Literature', U.C.R., I, (1943), 83-93; Sorata Thera, 'Visuddhimārga Mahāsannaya', Sāhityaya, Daṁbadeni Kalāpaya, 74-87.

[2] Sāhityaya, Daṁbadeni Kalāpaya, Punchi Bandāra Sannasgala, 43-52; Ed. D.E.Hettiaratchchi, see Introduction; Godakumbura, Sinh.Lit.; 61-66.

[3] Martin Wickramasinghe, Simhala Sāhityayē Nāngīma, fifth edition (Colombo, 1954), C.E.Godakumbura, Sinh.Lit., 81-88; D E.Hettiaratchchi, Sāhityaya, Daṁbadeni Kalāpaya, 53-62.

development of the Sinhalese language, which gradually became a more pliable instrument in the hands of these writers, whose works were followed by the later writers. 'The Pūjāvaliya more than any other book of Sinhalese prose has been the model for Sinhalese writers during periods of literary revival'.[1]

The Rasavāhinī, which is a compilation of Buddhist stories of an earlier date by the Vedeha Thera, is a work composed in the Dambadeṇi period. 'Vedeha who was of a poetic temperament, and, therefore, loved beauty of diction, was not satisfied with such an inartistic presentation of these homely stories and he, therefore, proceeded to clothe them in a new garb. The result is the Rasavāhinī, exquisite in its simplicity, charming in its naïveté, and delightful in its innocence.'[2] The Samantakūṭa Vaṇṇanā also a Pali work of the same author, is a compilation of 800 verses, and claims to be a description of the peak on which the Buddha is said to have implanted his foot print. But the author has also described in it many incidents in the life of the Buddha as well as the scenic beauty of the hills, mountains and valleys of several parts of the island.[3] The Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa to which we have already drawn attention, deals with the historyof the Hatthavanagalla

---

[1] Godakumbura, Sinh. Lit., 66; see Sāhityaya, Daṁbadeṇi Kalāpaya, comment on p.6.

[2] G. P. Malalasekara, Pali Lit. Cey., 225, Ed. Saranatissa (1926), see bibliography for Devarakkhita Ther'a edition.

[3] G. P. Malalasekara, op.cit., 223-24.

Vihāra; it is a Pali poem with a strong influence of Sanskrit displaying at the same time a fair degree of literary merit. It was composed at the request of Anomadassi Mahāsāmi, during the reign of Parākramabāhu II.[1] Buddhappiya's Pajjamadhu was also written during this period. It is written in cultivated Pali and deals with the beauty of the person of the Buddha.[2]

The writers of this period did not confine themselves to the exposition and explanation of the doctrines of the Buddha. They also ventured into more mundane fields of knowledge such as grammar, prosody, medicine and astrology. As a matter of fact some of these branches of learning were considered unsuited to be pursued by the Buddhist monks. The Dambadeni Katikāvata lays down the injunction that 'One should not learn the despicable sciences such as poetry and drama. (One) should not teach (them) to others'.[3] These injunctions did not deter the monk-authors from trying their hand in these 'despicable sciences', and some of them, indeed, made clever excuses for undertaking the writing of such works. For example the Mayurapāda Thera who was the author of two Sinhalese medical works, the Yōgārṇavaya and the Prayōgaratānāvaliya, states in justification of writing these works that he com-

---

[1] Ed. C. E. Godakumbura, P.T.S. (1956); See introduction; Pali Lit. Cey., op.cit., 218-19.

[2] Malalasekara, op.cit., 222.

[3] Kāvya nāṭakādī garhita vidyā tamā nūgatayutu. Anunut nūgāṇviya yutu, Ktk. Sng., 15.

posed these books dealing with the various methods of healing in order that people may be free from disease, facilitating thereby a healthy virtuous life so that they could attain Release. He has stated that disease was an impediment to the attainment of that objective.[1] The Anomadassi Mahāsāmi who wrote in Sanskrit verses a book on astrology, the Daivajñakāmadhenu, however, had given no such pretext, but it is clearly a field not permissible to a Buddhist monk, included in the category of 'despicable sciences' (garhita vidyā).[2] This illustrates the divergent interests and the diversified nature of the pursuit of knowledge in this period, which often bypassed the boundaries set out for the conduct of the Buddhist monks, in cases where the latter were writers. Among the medical works of this period mention may also be made of the Pali Bhesajja mañjusā (Casket of Medicine) composed by the Pañcamūla Pariveṇādhipati (Pasmula Mahāsāmi).[3]

Grammar (viyākaraṇa) was another important fruitful field to which the authors of the period devoted their energies. Grammatical works dealing with the grammar of both Pali and Sinhalese came to be written. Buddhappiya Thera wrote the Rūpasiddhi or Pada-rūpa Siddhi dealing with the etymology of the parts of speech in the Pali language,

---

[1] See the opening passages in the Yogārṇava, ed. Kiriällē Ñaṇavimala.

[2] Ed. C. A. Silakkhanda Sthavira and Sītarāma Upadyāya (Benares, 1906).

[3] Ed. Urugamuvē Candajoti (1924), see bibliography for Dhammāvāma Thera's edition.

modelled on Kaccāyana but treating the subject in greater detail.[1] Payogasiddhi of Vanaratana Medhaṅkara, based on the Moggallāna system of grammar is another important work on the subject.[2] Equally important in the field of grammar is the Sidatsaṅgarāva written during the reign of Parākramabāhu II, which is to this day the only extant work on Sinhalese grammar. It has become an almost indispensible work for modern Sinhalese scholars who undertake the study of the Sinhalese language, pursued alike in the traditional seats of learning as well as the modern universities of Ceylon.[3]

If we subscribe to the general view held by a majority of Sinhalese scholars that the Kavsilumina is a work of Parākramabāhu II, as also the standard Sinhalese grammar still enjoying unrivalled authority, we have in this period the best example of a mahākāvya (epic poem) written in the Sinhalese language. The work amply illustrates the author's poetic gifts and profound learning in addition to his mastery of the canons of Sanskrit poetics. Kavsilumina still enjoys a very high reputation among the Sknhalese literati.[4] Parākramabāhu is also credited with the authorship of the Vanavinisa Sannaya a Sinhalese translation of the Vinaya Vinicchaya which is a treatise on the Discipline of

---

[1]Ed. Dehigaspe Paññāsāra (Colombo, 1925); see also Malalasekara, Pali Lit. Cey., 220-21.

[2]Malalasekara, Op.cit., 230-32.

[3]Ed. Munidāsa Kumāraṇatuṅga, second edition (Colombo, 1954), see introduction to Geiger's Grammar of the Sinhalese Language; Godakumbura, Sinh. Lit., 318-20.

[4]Sorata Thera discusses its authorship in his introduction to his edition

(cont.)

the Saṃgha. We have here referred only to a few of the literary works representative of the different fields in which the writers of the period gave expression to their learning. These would, however, suffice to illustrate the fact that the various measures adopted by the Daṃbadeṇi kings to promote learning and scholarship were not in vain. Apart from the quantitative output, which is remarkable, quite a few of them possess a high degree of literary and artistic merit. This is a noteworthy development in a period in which the country was repeatedly invaded by foreign rulers resulting in instability and confusion in the general situation in the country. The determined efforts which the Daṃbadeṇi kings made to rescue Buddhism from the great hardships to which it had been reduced in these troubled times, as well as the various measures they adopted to promote learning and scholarship, and the incessant struggle to which these rulers were committed to maintain the autonomy of their kingdom in the face of foreign invasions, have to be kept in mind, even though their achievements in the political sphere are less striking and appear to pale before the glowing achievements of the Age of Parākramabāhu I, to which one may be naturally attracted in a study of the island's history in a period of dwindling fortunes.

(cont.) of this text, (Wāllampoṭiya, 1946), and assigns its authorship to Vijayabāhu II; see Degammada Sumanajoti Thera, for a summary of other views on the subject; Sāhityaya, Daṃbadeṇi Kalāpaya, 68-73; Godakumbura, Sinh. Lit., 148-51.

Conclusion

The main aspect of the history of Ceylon during the Polonnaruva period from the death of Parākramabāhu I to the foundation of Daṁbadeniya as a royal residence by Vijayabāhu III is one of rapid disintegration, manifested both in the political and the economic fields, though more clearly in the former. This process reached a marked stage with the invasion and sack of Rājaraṭṭha by Māgha, who established himself as its ruler with his capital at Polonnaruva.

It may appear surprising that such a fate overtook the Sinhalese kingdom so soon after the death of Parākramabāhu, whose reign in some respects marks the culmination of the Sinhalese civilisation. The causes usually suggested to explain its rapid decline, such as foreign invasions and the spread of Malaria appear to be of doubtful validity. Though Parākramabāhu cannot be held entirely responsible for these developments, it has emerged sufficiently clearly that his ambitious policies both at home and abroad had important repercussions on the fate which befell the Sinhalese kingdom after his death. Thus Māgha's attacks fell on a kingdom which was already weakened politically and possibly also economically and had lost much of its vigour and vitality. The oppressive rule he established only hastened its further decline.

The prevailing ideas about Māgha and his reign could be considerably modified in the light of our study. In the first place, it would

be difficult to dismiss Māgha as a mere adventurer who ruled Rājaraṭṭha for a time, as is often put forward. For, quite apart from other considerations, his rule over Rājaraṭṭha covered a period of about half a century. Secondly, the common belief that the entire reign of Māgha was one of unqualified oppression and cruelty had to be considerably modified. Such an accusation may apply mainly to the first part of his reign. It would be unfair to endorse the unqualified viewpoint of the Cūlavaṃsa, which has coloured the present image of Māgha, that he was nothing but a blood-thirsty tyrant. Thirdly, it is sufficiently clear that Māgha's policies were not dictated by political considerations alone, but that his persecution of Buddhism was motivated by tendencies suggestive of religious fanaticism. This aspect of his rule would be particularly significant as it is clearly contrary to the spirit of religious tolerance, which has marked the relations between the different Indian creeds and sects throughout the ages. Although we have pointed out the striking similarities in the tenets and attitudes of the Vīraśaivas - a Śaivite sect with fanatical tendencies which rose to prominence in Southern India during this period - it has not been possible to establish his precise religious identity with the limited data at our disposal. Māgha was perhaps one of the notable exceptions to the spirit of religious tolerance known from certain parts of India during this period.

The present-day image of Parākramabāhu II is that of an erudite scholar whose name has been immortalised by the great Sinhalese poem

Kavsilumina, the authorship of which is ascribed to him, apart from two other notable works. To the literati of today his name is always associated with the title Kalikāla Sāhitya Sarvagña Pandita, which bears testimony to his learning. In addition to this image, which reflects on the personality of this monarch, the times in which he flourished are also best remembered as an age of prolific literary activity. It has emerged from our study that, while this memory of Parākramabāhu and his times is not unworthy of him, his long reign was one of momentous significance also in the political history of the island.

Māgha had already established himself as a ruler of Rājaraṭṭha many years before Parākramabāhu's accession to the throne. Apart from Māgha, Candrabhānu - a Jāvaka ruler from the kingdom of Tāmbralinga in the Malay Peninsula - invaded Ceylon twice during his reign. The accounts in the Pali Chronicle of these two Jāvaka invasions create the impression that they were merely sporadic incursions which were successfully repelled. It would emerge from our study that Candrabhānu had brought considerable areas of Rājaraṭṭha under his control and sought a career in Ceylon.

Equally important are the invasions of Ceylon by the Pāndyas during the reign of Parākramabāhu II. By our examination of the Pāndya inscriptions, particularly the Kudumiyamalai Prasasti of Vīra Pāndya, whose expedition is recorded with considerable detail, it has emerged that this event led to active intervention in the affairs of Ceylon. These invasions are not mentioned in the Chronicles,

but they would have us believe that Parākramabāhu's fame had spread in foreign lands such as those of the Pāṇḍyas and the Coḷas. The historicity of the Pāṇḍya invasions referred to in these records is beyond doubt, though the account contains exaggerations. In the light of these data we are now able to modify further the picture of Parākramabāhu II and his times presented by the Ceylon Chronicles.

Though Parākramabāhu was by no means a warrior, and was certainly not made of the warlike calibre of Vijayabāhu I and Parākramabāhu I, he was called upon to defend his kingdom against these invaders at a critical stage of the island's history. There is no evidence that Parākramabāhu went out to battle in person, but certainly his sons and other members of the royal family committed themselves ardently and fought in defence of his kingdom. After a protracted struggle, Parākramabāhu succeeded in bringing parts of Rājaraṭṭha temporarily under his control so that he was able to hold his consecration in the former capital of Polonnaruva, to restore the Tooth Relic to its traditional shrine in the latter city, and to have the Upasampadā ceremony performed in the traditional site in Sahassatittha. Considerable restoration work was also undertaken in the ancient cities of Anurādhapura and Polonnaruva.

These activities did not, however, lead to the permanent occupation of Rājaraṭṭha. His effective authority appears to have been mainly confined to Māyāraṭṭha. In spite of his long and partly successful struggle with foreign invaders, the decline of Rājaraṭṭha, which had been the centre of the ancient Sinhalese civilization, could

not be arrested so as to yield lasting results.

Even if Parākramabāhu failed to reclaim Rājaraṭṭha and restore its ancient splendour - a task to which indeed none of his successors was equal - he gave the people of Māyāraṭṭha an appreciable measure of comparative peace. An earnest attempt was made to rescue Buddhism from the plight to which it had been reduced. The patronage extended by Parākramabāhu and other members of the royal family led to the emergence of reputed centres of learning, the scholarship of whose learned inmates shed lustre on an age otherwise so marred by foreign invasions. These men of letters dedicated themselves to worthy pursuits of peace, undeterred as it were by the political upheavals of their times. The result was a large body of literature, which is remarkable not only on quantitative but also on qualitative considerations. In sculpture, painting and architecture hardly anything comparable with the grandeur of the monuments in Rājaraṭṭha has come to light. Thus, to those who are impressed by the great achievements of Parākramabāhu I the work of his namesake may offer little satisfaction. However, considering the times in which he flourished and the exacting demands made of him, it would do this ruler less than justice to underestimate his contribution.

Another important point that has emerged from our study is that the rule of the Dambadeṇiya kings, the main feature of which has been usually taken to be its prolific literary activity, was never-

theless a period of great importance in the political history of Ceylon - a fact which has not been sufficiently recognized. Perhaps the fact that Parākramabāhu was a great scholar-king has obscured the political significance of his reign. He lived in an age of momentous developments in the history of Ceylon. Parākramabāhu's brilliance as a scholar should not be allowed to obscure the political importance of his reign.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Literary Sources

Pali and Sanskrit

Bhesajjamañjusā — ed. Varadivela Dhammārāma Thera and Dumbara Dhammaddhaja Thera, Maradāna, 1934.

Cūlavaṃsa — ed. Wilhelm Geiger, 2 vols., P.T.S., London, 1925, 1927.

** Cūlavaṃsa — tr. Wilhelm Geiger, translated from the German into English by C. Mabel Rickmers, 2 pts., Colombo, 1953.

Daivagñakāmadhenu — ed. C.S. Sīlakkhanda Thera and Sītārāma Upādhyāya, Benares, 1906.

Dāṭhāvaṃsa — with Sinhalese Paraphrase, ed. Āsaba Tissa Kälaniya, 1883.

Hatthavanagallavihāravaṃsa — ed. C.E Godakumbura, P.T.S., London, 1956.

Jinākālamālī — ed. A.P.Buddhadatta, P.T.S., London, 1962.

Jinālankāra — ed. Paṇḍita Rākava Pālita Sthavira, Mātara, 1955.

Mahāvaṃsa — ed. Wilhelm Geiger, P.T.S., London, 1908.

* Mahāvaṃsa — English translation by Wilhelm Geiger assisted by M.H.Bode, reprinted Colombo, 1950; first published 1912.

Mohavicchedanī — ed. A.P.Buddhadatta and A.K.Warder, P.T.S., London, 1961.

Padasādhana — ed. Ratmalānē Dhammakitti Siri Dharmānanda, Kälaniya, 1932.

Padasādhana Tīkā — ed. Śrī Dhīrananda and Vācissara, 1908.

Pajjamadhu — ed. Hakmana Siri Saṅghatissā, Ambalaṃgoḍa, 1941.

Paramatthavinicchaya — ed. Devānanda Thera, Colombo, 1926.

Rājatarangiṇī, a Chronicle of the Kings of Kasmir,	translated by A.M.Stein, 2vols., Westminster, 1900.
Rasavāhinī Vyākhyā	ed. Dhammakitti Devarakkhita Thera, re-edited by Medhaṃkara Thera, second edition, Colombo, 1930.
Rūpasiddhi	ed. Dehigaspē Paññāsāra, Colombo, 1925.
Sahassavatthuppakaraṇa	ed. A.P.Buddhadatta, Ambalaṃgoḍa, 1959.
Sīhaḷavatthuppakaraṇa	ed. A.P.Buddhadatta, Ambalaṃgoḍa, 1959.
Samantakūṭavaṇṇanā	ed. C.E.Goḍakumbura, P.T.S., London, 1958.
Thūpavaṃsa	ed. B.C.Law, P.T.S., London, 1935.
Upāsakajanālaṅkāra	ed. Moraṭoṭa Dhammakkhanda Thera, revised by Kosgoḍa Paññāsekhara Thera, Väligama,1914.
Vaṃsatthappakāsinī	Commentary on the Mahāvaṃsa, ed. G.P. Malalasekara, P.T.S., London, 1935.
Vinayavinicchaya	ed. Välitara Sudassana, Colombo, 1940.
Vuttodaya	ed. Väliparanvila Dīpaṅkara Thera, Aluṭgama, 1925.

Sinhalese

Daḷadā Pūjāvaliya	ed. Kanadullē Ratanaraṃsi Thera, Colombo, 1954.
Daḷadā Sirita	ed. Välivitiyē Sorata, Colombo, 1954.
Daṁbadeni Asna,	ed. Kiriällē Ñāṇavimala Thera in Kuveni, Sihabā saha Dambadeni Asna, pp. 30-39, Colombo, 1960.
Daṁbadeni Katikāvata	ed. Sir D. B. Jayatilaka in his Katikāvat Saṅgarā, pp. 6-21, reprinted Kälaniya 1955, first published 1922.
Dhampiyā Aṭuva Gäṭapadaya	ed. D. B. Jayatilaka, Colombo, 1932.

Dhātuvaṁsaya	ed. Giṁtoṭa Dhammakkhanda, Doḍandūva, 1889.
Eḷu Attanagaluvaṁsaya	(of Śaka year 1324) ed. P. Āriyaratna, Colombo, 1932.
Eḷu Attanagaluvaṁsaya	(Vīdāgama) ed. Rā. Tennakon, Colombo, 1954.
Girāsandeśaya	ed. Makuḷudūvē Piyaratana, Colombo, 1948.
Kaṅdavuru Sirita	ed. Sir D. B. Jayatilaka in his Siṁhala Sahitya Lipi, pp. 63-66, reprinted Maharagama, 1956.
Kavsiḷumiṇa	ed. Vāliviṭiyē Sorata Thera, Colombo, 1946.
Kāvyaśekharaya	edited with paraphrase, Dharmakirti Śrī Dharmārāma, Colombo, 1915.
Kōkila Sandeśaya	ed. Hädigallē Paññā Tissa Thera, Colombo, 1945.
Katikāvat Saṅgarā	ed. D. B. Jayatilaka, reprinted Kälaṇiya 1955, first published Colombo, 1922.
Mahābodhivaṁśa Gäṭapada Vivaraṇaya	ed. Dharmakīrti Śrī Dharmārāma, Colombo, 1910.
Nikāya Saṁgrahaya	ed. D.P.R.Samaranāyaka, Colombo, 1960.
Nikāya Saṁgrahaya	English translation by C.M.Fernando, revised edition by Mudaliyar D.F.Gunavardhana, Colombo, 1908.
Pansiyapaṇas Jātaka Pota	ed. Nāvullē Dhammānanda Thera and Devinuvara Ratanajoti Thera, Colombo, 1955.
Pärakumbā Sirita	ed. Amarasiri Guṇavardhana, Colombo, 1953.
Prayogaratnāvaliya	ed. Kiriällē Nāṇavimala, Veragama, 1948.
Pūjāvaliya	ed. Bentara Śraddhā Tiṣya, Pāṇadura, 1930.
Pūjāvaliya	Chapters 1-11, ed. D.E.Heṭṭiāracci and D.C. Disānāyaka, Colombo, 1936; chapters 12-16 edited by D.E Heṭṭiāracci, Colombo, 1948.
Pūjāvaliya	Chapter xxxiv, ed. Mābōpiṭiyē Medhaṁkara, Colombo, 1932.

Pūjāvaliya	33-34 Pariccheda, ed. A.V.Suravīra, Colombo, 1961.
Rājāvaliya	ed. B. Guṇasēkara, reprinted Colombo, 1953.
Rājāvaliya	translated into English by B. Guṇasēkara, reprinted Colombo, 1954, first published 1900.
Rūpasiddhi Sannaya	ed. H. Sīlaratana, Hōmāgama, 1929.
Sasadāvata	ed. Aturuvällē Dhammapāla, Colombo, 1934.
Saddharmālankāraya	ed. Bentara Śraddhā Tiṣya, Pāṇadura, 1934.
Saddharma Ratnākaraya	ed. Kalupaluvāvē Dharmakīrti Śrī Suguṇasāra Devānanda Thera, second edition, Colombo, 1955.
Saddharma Ratnāvaliya	ed. Sir D.B.Jayatilaka, Colombo, 1930.
Säḷḷihiṇi Vivaraṇaya	ed. Munidāsa Kumāranatuṃga, second edition, Colombo, 1930.
Sidat Saňgarāva	ed. Munidāsa Kumāraṇatuṃga, second edition, Colombo, 1954.
Sidat Saňgarā Vistara Sannaya	ed. Ratmalānē Dharmakīrti Śrī Dharmārāma Thera, Vidyā Prabodha Yantrālaya, 1934.
Siṃhala Bodhivaṃsaya	ed. Baddēgama Kīrtiśrī Dhammaratana, Mātara, 1911.
Siṃhala Thūpavaṃsaya	ed. D.E.Hettiāracci, Colombo, 1947.
Visuddhimārga Sannaya	ed. M. Dharmaratna, 8 pts, I-VI, Colombo, 1890-1926; pts. VII-VIII were continued by Väboḍa Saṃgharatana Thera, Hōmāgama, 1946, 1948.
Visuddhimārga Sannaya	ed. Bentara Saddhā Tiṣya, Kaḷutara, 1950-55.
Yogaratnākaraya	ed. Don. George Samaratuṅga, 1958.
Yogārṇava	ed. Kiriällē Ñāṇavimala, 1943.

Manuscripts

Alutnuvara Dēvālaya Karavīma, British Museum Library, Manuscript No. Or. 6606 (145).

Buddha Rājāvaliya, British Museum Library, Manuscript No. OR.5290 (13) A.c.

Dāthāvamsa-kavi, British Museum Library, Manuscript No. Or.6606 (129).

Kurunāgala Vistaraya, British Museum Library, Manuscript No. Or.6607 (12).

II Archaeological Material

Ancient Inscriptions of Ceylon, E. Muller, London, 1883.

Annual Reports on South Indian Epigraphy, 1887-1945.

Archaeological Survey of Ceylon Annual Reports, 1890-1962.

Ceylon Journal of Science Section G - Archaeology, Ethnology etc., Colombo, 1928-33.

Epigraphia Indica, Vols. I-XXXV, 1892-1963.

Epigraphia Zeylanica, Vols. I-V, 1904-55.

Inscriptions (texts) of the Pudukkottai State, Pudukkottai, 1929.

Memoirs of the Archeological Survey of Ceylon, Vols. I-VI, Colombo, 1924-1953.

Recueil des Inscriptions des Siam, Bangkok, 1924-1929.

South Indian Inscriptions (Archaeological Survey of India, Madras), Vols. II-XIII, 1913-1953.

*The translations of passages quoted from the Cūlavamsa and the Mahāvamsa are from Geiger's translations, with occasional modifications indicated in foot notes.

III Modern Works

Adikaram, E.W. — The Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon, Colombo, 1953.

Aiyangar, S. Krishnasamy — 'Kaliṅgadeśa', Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society, II (1911), 1-11.

Ariyapala, M.B. — Society in Mediaeval Ceylon (The State of Society in Ceylon as depicted in the Saddharmaratnāvaliya and other Literature of the Thirteenth Century), Colombo, 1956.

Arunachalam, Sir P. — 'Polonnaruva Bronzes and Śiva Worship and Symbolism', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXIV No. 68 (1915-16), 189-222.

Banerji, R.E. — History of Orissa from the Earliest Times to the British Period, 2 Vols. Calcutta, 1930, 1931.

Basham, A.L. — 'The Background to the Rise of Parākramabāhu I', C.H.J., IV (1954-55), 10-22.

——— — 'The Kashmir Chronicle', Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon, edited by C.H.Philips, London, 1961, 57-65.

Bell, H.C.P. — Report on the Kāgalla District of the Province of Sabaragamuva, Colombo, 1892.

Bhandarkar, R.G. — Vaiṣṇavism Śaivism and minor religious systems, Strassburg, 1913

Bode, M.H. — The Pali Literature of Burma, London, 1909.

Briggs, L.P. — The Ancient Khemer Empire. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series XLI, prts. 2 & 3, 1952, pp. 1-276.

Brohier, R.L. — Ancient Irrigation Works in Ceylon, 3 parts, Colombo, 1934-35.

Buddhadatta, A.P. — 'Some Corrections to Geiger's Mahāvaṃsa Translation', U.C.R., VII (1949), 106-118, 185-197.

——— — 'Some Corrections to Geiger's Cūlavaṃsa Translation', U.C.R., VIII (1950), 96-109, 161-180.

——— — 'Candrabhānu and a Miraculous Image', C.H.J., II (1952), 14-22.

——— — Pāli Sāhityaya, 2 parts, Ambalaṃgoḍa, 1960, 1962.

Cartman, Rev. James — Hinduism in Ceylon, Colombo, 1957.

Casparis, J. G. de — 'New Evidence on Cultural Relations between Java and Ceylon in Ancient Times', Artibus Asiae, XXIV (1962), 241-48.

Chatterjee, Bijan Raj — Indian Culture in Sumatra and Java, Calcutta, 1927.

Chelvanayakam, V. — 'Dates of Cilappatikāram and Maṇimekhalai', U.C.R., VI (1948), 96-105.

Codrington, H.W. — 'A Sinhalese Embassy to Egypt', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXVIII No. 72 (1919), 82-85.

——— 'Notes on Ceylon Topography in the Twelfth Century', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br, XXIX No. 75 (1922), 62-74: XXX (1925), 70-91.

——— 'Mediaeval Mercenary Forces in Ceylon', Ceylon Literary Register, Third Series, III, 385-92, 439-46.

——— 'Doraṭiyāva Sannasa', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXIX No. 77 (1924), 307-22.

——— Ceylon Coins and Currency, Colombo, 1924.

——— 'Notes on the Dambadeniya Dynasty', C.A.L.R., X (1924), 37-53, 88-99.

——— A Short History of Ceylon, Reprinted 1947, first published London, 1926.

——— 'Gāvuta Pillars', C.J.S.G., II (1930), 129-34.

——— 'The Problem of the Koṭagama Inscription', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXII No. 85 (1932), 214-25.

——— 'The Gampaḷa Period of Ceylon History', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXII (1933), 260-309.

——— 'The Decline of the Mediaeval Sinhalese Kingdom', (Text of lecture delivered before the Royal Asiatic Society, London in 1937), J.R.A.S. Cey.Br., NS. VII (1960), 93-103.

Coedès, G. — 'Le royaume de Çrīvijaya', B.E.F.E.O., XVIII No. 6 (1918), 1-36.

Coedès, G. — Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam, Bangkok, 1924-1929.

——— — 'A propos de la chute du royaume de Çrīvijaya', B.K.I., LXXXIII (1927), 459-72.

——— — Histoire ancienne des états hindouisés d'Extrême-Orient, Hanoi, 1944.

——— — Les états hindouisés d'Indochine et Indonésie, Paris, 1948.

——— — Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam, Deuxième Partie: Inscriptions de Dvāravatī, de Çrīvijaya et de Lavo, Deuxième édition revue et mise à jour, 1961.

——— — Les peuples de la Peninsule Indochinoise, Histoire Civilisations, Paris, 1962.

Coomaraswamy, A.K. — Mediaeval Sinhalese Art, Second edition, New York, 1956.

Coppleston, Rev. R.S. — 'The Identification of the Sirivaddhanapura of the Mahāvamsa Chapter LXXXV', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XII (1892), 206-22.

——— — 'The Epic of Parākrama', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XIII (1893), 60-77.

Cunningham, Sir Alexander — The Ancient Geography of India, edited by S. M. Sastri, Calcutta, 1924.

Deraniyagala, P.E.P. — 'Simhala Weapons and Armour', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXV No. 95 (1942), 97-134.

Devendra, D.T. — 'Dambadeniyē rajavarun hā pālanaya', Sāhityaya, Dambadeni Kalāpaya (1958), 22-27.

Dikshitar, V.R.R. — Studies in Tamil Literature and History, London, 1930.

——— — The Purāṇa Index, 3 Vols., Madras, 1951, 1952, 1955.

Dutt, Sukumar — Buddhist Monks and Monasteries of India, London, 1962.

Fernando, P.E.E. — 'Tantric Influence on the Sculptures at Gal Vihāra, Polonnaruva', U.C.R., XVIII (1960), 50-66.

Ferrand, G. — 'Malaka, le Malāyu et Malāyūr', J.A., 11^{e} série, XI (1918), 39-484; XII (1918), 51-154.

Ferrand, G. — 'L'empire Sumatranis de Çrīvijaya', J.A. XX (1922), 1-104 and 161-246.

Fleet, J.F. — 'Buddhagayā Inscriptions of Mahānāma', Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, III (1888), 274-79.

——— — The Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts of the Bombay Presidency from the Earliest Times to the Musalman Conquest of A.D.1318, Bombay, 1895.

——— — 'Inscriptions at Ablur', Ep. Ind., V No. 25, 237-60.

——— — 'The Day on which the Buddha Died', J.R.A.S., (1909), 1-34.

——— — 'The Origin of the Buddhavarsa, the Ceylonese Reckoning from the Death of the Buddha', J.R.A.S., (1909), 323-56.

Geiger, Wilhelm — The Dīpavamsa and the Mahāvamsa and their Historical Development in Ceylon, translated into English by Ethel M. Coomaraswamy, Colombo, 1908.

——— — 'The Trustworthiness of the Mahāvamsa', I.H.Q., VI (1930), 205-28; reprinted in C.H.J., IV (1954-55), 153-68.

——— — A Grammar of the Sinhalese Language, Colombo, 1938.

——— — Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times, edited by Heinz Bechert, Wiesbaden, 1960.

Giles, H.A. — The Travels of Fa-hsien (399-414 A.D.), Cambridge; reprinted London, 1959.

Giles, Lionel — 'Ming shih' Ch. 326, translated into English, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXIV No. 68 (1915-16), 119-23.

Godakumbura, C.E. — 'References to Buddhist Sanskrit Writers in Sinhalese Literature', U.C.R., I (1943), 86-93.

——— — 'The Cūlavamsa', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXVIII (1949), 123-25.

——— — Sinhalese Literature, Colombo, 1955.

Godakumbura, C.E. — 'Historical Writing in Sinhalese', Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon, (1961), 72-86.

——— — 'Bronzes from Polonnaruva', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VII (1961), 239-53.

Goloubew, Victor — 'The Art of India and Indo-China with special reference to Ceylon', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXI No. 83 (1930), 455-64.

Gnanaprakasar, Father S. — 'Sources of the Yāḷpāna-vaipavamālai', C.A.L.R., VI, 135-41.

Grimes, A. — 'The Journey of Fa-Hsien from Ceylon to Canton', J.R.A.S.Malay Branch, XIX (1941), 76-92.

Gunasekara, Mudaliyar B. — A Contribution to the History of Ceylon, translated from the Pūjāvaliya, Colombo, 1895.

Harvey, G.E. — History of Burma, London, 1925.

Heṭṭiāracci, D.E. — 'Saddharmaratnāvaliya', Sāhityaya, Daṁbadeṇi Kalāpaya, (1958), 53-62.

Hirth, F. and Rockhill, W.W. — Chau Ju-kua, His Work on the Chinese and Arab Trade in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, entitled Chu-fan-chï, St. Petersburg, 1911.

Hocart, A.M. — /Anurādhapura/, A.S.C.Mem. I, Colombo, 1924.

——— — /Polonnaruva/ A.S.C.Mem.II, Colombo, 1926.

——— — The Temple of the Tooth in Kandy, A.S.C.Mem. IV,

Howard, J. — 'Note on the fortification of Yāpahuva', J.R.A.S. Cey.Br., XIV No. 47 (1896), 237-39.

Hultzsch, E. — 'Materials for Calculating the Date of Sundara Pāṇḍya', Ind.Ant., XXI (1892), 121-22.

——— — 'Contributions to Sinhalese Chronology', J.R.A.S., (1913), 517-31.

Jayatilaka, Sir D.B. — Simhala Sāhitya Lipi, Second impression, Maharagama, 1956.

Kanapathi Pillai, K. 'A Tamil Inscription from Paṇḍuvasnuvara', U.C.R., XVIII (1960), 157-62.

Karuṇaratna, W.S. 'Daṁbadeṇi Samayē Pāli Sāhitya', Sāhityaya, Daṁbadeṇi Kalāpaya, (1958), 97-108.

Krom, N.J. 'De Ondergang van Çrīvijaya', Med.Kon.Akad. van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde., Deel LXII, No. 5. (1926), 151-71.

Kulasūriya, Ānanda Siṁhala Sāhityaya, Maharagama, 1961.

Laerolle, Julius de 'Place names of Ceylon', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXI No. 83 (1930), 510-27.

——— 'An Examination of Mr. Codrington's Work on Ancient Land Tenure and Revenue in Ceylon', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXIV No. 91 (1938) 199-219; see also 220-230.

Law, B.C. On the Chronicles of Ceylon, Calcutta, 1947.

Le May, R. A Concise History of Buddhist Art in Siam, Cambridge, 1938.

Levi D'ancona, Mirella 'Amarāvatī, Ceylon, and Three "Imported" Bronzes', Art Bulletin, XXXIV, 1-17.

Levi, M. Sylvain 'Le Missions de Wang Hieuen Ts'e dans L'Inde', J.A., (1900), 297-331, 401-468. (For English translation of the portions relating to Ceylon see John M. Seneviratna, J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXIV (1915-16), 74-123.

Liyanagamage, A. and Gunavardhana, R. Anurādhapura Yugaya, Kälaṇiya, 1961.

Majumdar, R.C. Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East, I Champā; II Suvarnadvīpa, 2 parts, i Political History, ii Cultural History, Lahore, 1927.

——— Hindu Colonies in the Far East, Calcutta, 1944.

——— Kambujadeśa or an Ancient Indian Colony in Cambodia, Madras, 1944.

——— H.C.I.P. series II, The Age of Imperial Unity, Bombay, 1951; III, The Classical Age, Bombay, 1954; IV, The Age of Imperial Kanauj, Bombay, 1955; V, The Struggle for Empire, Bombay, 1957.

Majumdar, R.C. — Ancient Indian Colonisation in South East Asia, Baroda, 1955.

Malalasekara, G.P. — The Pali Literature of Ceylon, reprinted Colombo, 1958; first published 1928.

——— — Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, 2 Vols., reprinted London, 1960; first published 1937.

McCrindle, J.W. — Ancient India as Described in Classical Literature, London, 1901.

——— — Ancient India as Described by Ptolemy, edited by S. N. Majumdar, Calcutta, 1927.

Mendis, G.C. — The Early History of Ceylon, Second edition, Calcutta, 1935, first published 1932.

——— — 'The Pali Chronicles, An Examination of the Opinions Expressed about them since 1879', U.C.R., IV (1946) 1-24.

——— — 'The Chronology of the Pali Chronicles of Ceylon', U.C.R., V (1947), 39-54.

Modder, F.H. — 'The Animal shaped Rocks of Kurunāgala', J.R.A.S. Cey.Br., XI (1890), 377-425.

——— — 'Kurunāgala Vistaraya, with notes on Kurunāgala, Ancient and Modern', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XIII No. 44 (1893), 35-57.

——— — 'Ancient Cities and Temples in the Kurunāgala District: Ridī Vihāra', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XIV No. 47 (1896), 118-24; 'Paṇḍuvasnuvara', 134-54; 'Daṃbadeniya', XV, No. 48 (1897), 23-37.

Mudiyanse, N — 'Kurunāgala saha Gampala pilibaṇda aitihāsika toraturu', Itihāsaya, III No. 2 (1962), 85-100.

Muller, E. — Ancient Inscriptions of Ceylon, London. 1883.

Nagel, Lieutenant Thomas — 'Account of the Vanni, 1773', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXVIII No. 106 (1948), 69-74.

Nandimath, S.C. — A Handbook of Vīrasaivism, Dharwar, 1942.

Navaratnam, C.S. — Tamils and Ceylon, Jaffna, 1958.

Nicholas, C.W. 'Titles of the Sinhalese Kings as Recorded in the Inscriptions of the 3rd Century B.C. to 3rd Century A.C.', U.C.R., VII (1949), 235-48.

——— 'Epigraphical Map of Ceylon, 3rd Century B.C. to 3rd Century A.C.', U.C.R., VII (1949), 142-45.

——— 'The Territorial Divisions of Ceylon from Early Times to the Twelfth Century', U.C.R., IX (1951), 20-50.

——— 'Texts of the Cave Inscriptions in the Ruhuṇa National Park', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. II (1952), 126-40.

——— 'The Irrigation Works of King Parākramabāhu I', C.H.J. (1954-55), 52-68.

——— 'Brāhmī Inscriptions in the Yāla East Wild Life Reserve', Sir Paul E. Pieris Felicitation Volume, Colombo, 1956, 56-58.

——— 'Sinhalese Naval Power', U.C.R., XVI (1958), 78-92.

——— 'Historical Topography of Ancient and Mediaeval Ceylon', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. Special Number (1959).

——— 'A Short Account of the History of Irrigation Works up to the 11th Century', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VII (1960), 43-69.

——— 'Additions and Amendments to the Historical Topography of Ancient and Mediaeval Ceylon', J.R.A.S. Cey.Br., NS. VII (1961), 224-30.

Nicholas, C.W. and Paranavitana, S. A Concise History of Ceylon, Colombo, 1962.

Nilakanta Sastri, K.A. The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, London, 1929.

——— 'Śrīvijaya, Candrabhānu and Vīra Pāṇḍya', T.B.G., LXXVII (1937), 251-68.

——— The Cōḷas, second (revised) edition, Madras, 1955; first published 2 volumes, Madras, 1935, 1937.

——— 'The Ceylon Expedition of Jaṭavarman Vīra Pāṇḍya', 8th All.Ind.Or.Conf., (1937), 508-26.

Nilakanta Sastri,K.A. Foreign Notices of South India from Megasthenes to Ma Huan, Madras, 1939.

——— 'Śrīvijaya', B.E.F.E.O., XL (1940), 239-313.

——— 'The Tamil Land and the Eastern Colonies', Journal of the Greater India Society, XI (1944), 26-28.

——— History of Śrivijaya, Madras, 1949.

——— 'Dates of Cilappatikāram and Manimekhalai', U.C.R., VII (1949), 21-27.

——— 'An Episode in Pandyan History', 15th All Ind.Or. Conf., 1949, 294-97.

——— 'Vijayabāhu I - the Liberator of Laṅkā', J.R.A.S. Cey.Br., NS. IV (1955), 45-71.

——— 'Parākramabāhu and South India', C.H.J., IV (1954-55), 33-51.

——— A History of South India from Prehistoric Times to the Fall of Vijayanagar, Madras, 1955.

——— 'Buddhism in the Tamil Country', New India, V No. 22, Dec. 1956.

——— 'A Note on Vīraśaivism - its History and Doctrine', 18th All Ind.Or.Conf., Anamalainagar, 1958, 386-91.

——— 'Ceylon as a Province of the Cola Empire', U.C.H.C. I, Pt. II (1960), 411-15.

——— 'Ceylon and Śrīvijaya', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. VIII (1962), 125-40.

Norman, M.C. 'A Defence of the Chronicles of the Southern Buddhists', J.R.A.S. (1908), 1-16.

Pandita, Vincent 'Buddhism during the Polonnaruva Period', C.H.J., IV (1954-55). 113-29.

Pannasara, Dehigaspe Sanskrit Literature Extant among the Sinhalese, Colombo, 1958.

Paranavitana, S. 'The Colas and Ceylon', C.A.L.R., X (1924), 114-21.

Paranavitana, S. 'Epigraphical Summary', C.J.S.G., II (1928), 17-29, (1930) 99-128, (1933) 175-228.

——— 'Mahāyānism in Ceylon', C.J.S.G., II (1928), 35-71.

——— 'Three Cola Invasions not Recorded in the Mahāvamsa', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXI No. 82 (1929), 384-87.

——— 'The Capital of Ceylon during the Ninth and Tenth Centuries', C.J.S.G., II (1930), 141-47.

——— 'Buddhist Festivals in Ceylon', Buddhistic Studies edited by B.C.Law, Calcutta, 1931, 528-46.

——— 'Religious Intercourse between Burma and Siam in the 13th-15th Centuries', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXII (1932), 190-213.

——— 'Matrilineal Descent in the Sinhalese Royal Family', C.J.S.G., II (1933), 235-40.

——— The Excavations in the Citadel of Anurādhapura, A.S.C.Mem., III Colombo, 1936.

——— 'Two Royal Titles of the Early Sinhalese and the Origin of Kingship in Ancient Ceylon', J.R.A.S. (1936), 444-62.

——— 'The Kāliṅga Dynasty of Ceylon', Journal of the Greater India Society, III (1936), 57-64.

——— 'Negapatam and Theravāda Buddhism in South India', Journal of the Greater India Society, XI (1944),17-25.

——— 'Sigiri - the Abode of a God-king', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br. NS.I (1950), 129-83.

——— The Shrine of Upulvan at Devundara, A.S.C.Mem.,VI, Colombo, 1953.

——— 'The Art and Architecture of the Polonnaruva Period', reprinted in C.H.J., IV (1954-55), 69-90.

——— 'The Chronology of the Ceylon kings, Mahāsena-Mahinda V', Ep. Zeyl., V (1955), 86-111.

——— 'Glimpses of the Political and Social Conditions of Mediaeval Ceylon', Sir Paul E. Pieris Felicitation Volume, Colombo, 1956, 69-74.

Paranavitana, S. — God of Adam's Peak, Ascona, 1958.

——— — 'Ceylon and Malaysia in Medaeval Times', J.R.A.S. Cey.Br., NS. VII (1960), 1-42.

——— — 'The Ārya Kingdom in the North of Ceylon', J.R.A.S. Cey.Br., NS. VII (1961), 174-224.

Parker, H. — Ancient Ceylon, London, 1909.

Perera, B.J. — 'An Examination of the Political Troubles that followed the Death of Parākramabāhu', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., NS. V (1958), 173-82.

Perera, E.W. — 'Alakeśvara: his Life and Times', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XVIII No. 55 (1904), 281-308.

——— — 'The Age of Parākramabāhu VI', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXII No. 10 (1910), 6-44.

Perera, L.S. — 'The Royal Lineage in the Prasastis of the 8th-10th Century Inscriptions', C.H.J. II (1952), 229-36.

——— — 'The Pali Chronicle of Ceylon', Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon, London, 1961.

Philips, C.H. — Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon, London, 1961.

Pieris, P.E. — 'Nāgadīpa and Buddhist Remains in Jaffna', J.R.A.S. Cey.Br., XXVIII No. 72 (1919), 40-67.

Rahula, Walpola — History of Buddhism in Ceylon, the Anurādhapura Period - 3rd Century B.C. 10th Century A.C., Colombo, 1956.

——— — 'Sahassavatthu atthakathā or Sahassavatthuppakaraṇa', U.C.R., II (1944), 86-91.

Ramachandran, T.N. — Nāgarjunakonda, Arch. Surv. Ind. Memoir, No. 71, New Delhi, 1953.

Rammaṇḍala, M. Śrī — 'Dambadeṇi Katikāvata hā Śāsana Tatvaya', Sāhityaya, Dambadeṇi Kalāpaya (1958), 90-96.

Rasanayagam Mudaliyar, C. — Ancient Jaffna, Madras, 1929.

Ray, H.C. and Paranavitana, S. — History of Ceylon, Vol. 1, two parts, Colombo, 1959, 1960.

Ray, H.C. — A Dynastic History of Northern India, 2 Vols., Calcutta, 1931, 1936.

Rhoads, Murphey — 'The Ruin of Ancient Ceylon', J.A.S., XVI (1957), 181-200

Sannasgala, Puncibaṇḍāra — 'Pūjāvaliya', Sāhityaya (1958), Daṁbadeṇi Kalāpaya, 43-51.

Saparamadu, Sumana — 'The Sinhalese Language and Literature of the Polonnaruva Period', C.H.J., IV (1954-55), 91-97.

Sāsanaratana, Moraṭuvē — 'Daṁbadeṇi Samayē Sakubas Dänuma', Sāhityaya (1958) Daṁbadeṇi Kalāpaya, 109-21.

Sein Ko, Taw. — 'A Preliminary Study of the Kalyāṇi Inscriptions of Dharmacheti, 1476 A.D.', Ind. Ant., XXII (1893), 11-17, 29-53, 150-59, 206-13, 236-43, 274-75.

Seneviratna, John M. — 'The Date of Buddha's Death and Ceylon Chronology', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXIII, No. 67 (1914), 141-273.

Silva, W.A. de — 'Sinhalese Vittipot (Books of Incidents) and Kadaim-pot (Books of Division Boundaries)', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br. XXX No. 80 (1927), 303-25.

——— — 'A contribution to the study of Economic and Social Organization in Early Times', J.R.A.S.Cey.Br., XXXI No. 81 (1928), 62-76.

Sircar, D.C. — H.C.I.P., Ch. IV (1954): IV, Ch. VIII (1955): V, Ch. XII (1957).

Sorata Thera, Välivitiyē — 'Visuddhimārga mahāsannaya', Sāhityaya (1958), Daṁbadeṇi Kalāpaya, 109-21.

——— — Śrī Sumaṅgala Śabdakoṣya, 2 Vols. Colombo (1952, 1956.

Sumanajoti Thera, Degammäda — 'Kavsiḷumiṇa hā ehi Kartṛ', Sahityaya, (1958), Daṁbadeṇi Kalāpaya, 74-87.

——— — Daṁbadeṇi Yugaya, 3 parts, Vakkuṇuvala, 1958, 1960.

Sumanasēkara, Mädavela — 'Mātalē Kadaim Pot', Itihasaya, III (1961), 45-61.

——— — 'Mātalē Kadaim Pota', Itihasaya, III (1962), 73-84.

Suravīra, A.V. — 'Pūjāvaliya dakvana Lakdiva rājya pravṛtti', Sāhityaya (1958), No. 1, 67-73.

Tennent, Sir J.E. — Ceylon - an Account of the Island, Physical, Historical and Topographical, 2 Vols. London, 1859.

Warnakulasuriya, W.M.A. — 'Inscriptional Evidence bearing on the Nature of Religious Endowments in Ancient Ceylon', U.C.R., I (1943), 69-74: II ( ), 74-82, 92-96.

Wheatley, Paul — The Golden Khersonese, Studies in the Historical Geography of the Malay Peninsula before A.D. 1500, Kuala Lumpur, 1961.

Wickramasinghe, Sirima — 'The Sources for a Study of the Reign of Parākramabāhu I', C.H.J., IV (1954-55), 169-82.

——— — The Age of Parākramabāhu I, Ph.D. Thesis (unpublished) University of London, 1958.

——— — 'Successors of Parakramabāhu I: Downfall of the Polonnaru Kingdom', U.C.H.C., I, pt. II, 507-25.

Wickramasinghe, D.M. de Z. — Catalogue of the Sinhalese Manuscripts in the British Museum, London, 1900.

——— — 'The Ceylonese Chronology', Ep. Zeyl., III (1928),1-47.

Wijesekara, N.D. — 'A Comparative Study of the Early Sinhalese Paintings with contemporary Indian Paintings', C.H.J., I (1951) 97-108.

——— — The People of Ceylon, Colombo, 1951.

——— — Sinhalese Sculpture, Colombo, 1963.

Wijesekara, O.H. de A. — 'Pali and Sanskrit in the Polonnaruva Period', C.H.J., IV (1954-55), 91-97.

Wimalakitti Thera, Mädauyangoḍa — Śilālekhana Saṃgrahaya,

——— — 'Daṁbadeṇi Samayē Paṇḍivarun hā Piriven', Sāhityaya (1958), Daṁbadeṇi Kalāpaya, 35-39.

Wolters, O.W. — 'Tāmbraliṅga', B.S.O.A.S., XXI, (1958), 587-607.